

Also, petition of citizens of Timnath, Fort Collins, and Loveland, Larimer County, and Fort Morgan, Colo., against passage of bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, April 8, 1916.

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 30, 1916.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Secretary call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Jones	Pittman	Sutherland
Brady	Kenyon	Pinckney	Swanson
Chamberlain	Kern	Ransdell	Taggart
Clapp	Lane	Reed	Thomas
Clarke, Ark.	Lodge	Robinson	Thompson
Cummins	McCumber	Saulsbury	Tillman
Curtis	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Vardaman
Dillingham	Myers	Sheppard	Warren
du Pont	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	Weeks
Gallinger	Norris	Smith, S. C.	Williams
Husting	Overman	Smoot	
Johnson, Me.	Owen	Sterling	
Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Stone	

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] on official business. He is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY].

I also desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] on account of illness. These announcements will stand for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is not present. The Secretary will furnish the Sergeant at Arms with a list of absentees and that officer is directed to request their attendance.

Mr. HARDWICK entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

POTOMAC POWER PLANT.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. President, I have a communication from the Indianapolis Board of Trade, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the communication was read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, as follows:

THE INDIANAPOLIS BOARD OF TRADE,
Indianapolis, Ind., April 6, 1916.

Hon. THOMAS TAGGART,

DEAR SIR: In accordance with action taken by the governing committee of the Indianapolis Board of Trade, I am inclosing copy of resolution relative to the Government power plant at Washington, adopted by the committee at its regular monthly meeting, Monday evening, April 3, 1916.

Yours, very truly,

WM. H. HOWARD, Secretary.

The governing committee of the Indianapolis Board of Trade, at its regular monthly meeting, April 3, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the Park Commission plans for the future development of Washington resulting from the careful study of the many plans and able suggestions offered to the Government from time to time are based on the plan laid out over 100 years ago by Washington and Jefferson; and

"Whereas these plans offer to the Nation's Capital a tangible, economical system for the location of its public buildings, bridges, statutory, highways, neighborhood parks, and a practical solution for connecting Potomac Park, National Zoological Park, Rock Creek Park, Soldiers' Home Park, and the Eastern Branch Park, the Arsenal, the Mall, and Arlington through a system of smaller parks, drives, and bridges; and

"Whereas the Park Commission plans have been indorsed by two Presidents, by the Government-appointed Fine Arts Council, the National Commission of Fine Arts, the Lincoln Memorial Commission, and by many local, national, and foreign, business, civic, municipal, architectural, labor, scientific, patriotic, and landscape societies; and

"Whereas the location of a Government power plant near the center of the park system composed of East Potomac Park, Riverside Park, Arlington, and the Mall—this building and site has been condemned as unsightly and marring the Park Commission plans by the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the location has been proved uneconomical by eminent electrical and mechanical engineers—will interfere with the development of the river front, and the building and smokestacks will detract from the dignity of the buildings, monuments, and parks, and be destructive of the beauty of the parks: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the governing committee of the Indianapolis Board of Trade approve the Park Commission plans and earnestly urge upon Congress the importance of enacting a law directing that the development of Washington be according to these plans under the advice of the National Commission of Fine Arts; and be it

"Resolved, That we urge upon the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States that they reconsider the location of the Government power plant on the site selected; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be mailed to the President, our representatives in both branches of Congress, our local newspapers, and to Glenn Brown, chairman of the Committee of One Hundred on the Development of Washington, 806 Seventeenth Street NW, Washington, D. C."

GEO. H. EVANS, President.

Attest:

WM. H. HOWARD, Secretary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, requested the Senate to return to the House the bill (H. R. 10384) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States.

IMMIGRATION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the request of the House of Representatives for the return of the bill (H. R. 10384) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States. The Committee on Immigration will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and the request of the House of Representatives will be complied with.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, in connection with the recent debate on that portion of the bill now before us which referred to the Federal volunteers, and incidentally to the military training camps, I present a letter from the secretary of the Military Training Camps Association, together with a copy of a letter to the governing committee of that association from the Secretary of War, which, as throwing light on the whole question, which was so long debated, I ask may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read, unless there is objection. The Chair hears none.

The Secretary read as follows:

NEW YORK CITY, April 6, 1916.

Hon. HENRY A. DU PONT,

United States Senate, the Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In connection with the debate on the Federal volunteer provision (sec. 56) of the Chamberlain bill, questions have been raised as to the precise extent and character of the Federal training-camp movement. We wish the Senate to have full and authentic information as to the scope and present status of the camps, and respectfully present the following facts.

Camps announced for 1916 by the commanders of the four military departments are as follows:

EASTERN DEPARTMENT.

Fort Oglethorpe, Ga.: Three camps—May 3 to August 8.

Plattsburg, N. Y.: Five camps—June 3 to October 5.

CENTRAL DEPARTMENT.

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indianapolis, Ind.: Three camps—July 5 to October 5.

SOUTHERN DEPARTMENT.

San Antonio, Tex.: One camp—June 12 to July 8.

Galveston, Tex.: One camp—June 5 to July 1.

WESTERN DEPARTMENT.

Monterey, Cal.: One camp—July 10 to August 5.

Salt Lake City, Utah: July.

American Lake, Wash.: July.

Recruiting for these camps has hardly yet been started, but already 3,503 men have actually signed for the Plattsburg camps and considerable numbers (exact figures not at hand) for the other camps. Plattsburg enrollments are coming in at the rate of over 100 per day; and as enrollments for all camps will greatly increase later in the season, we can safely estimate a minimum final enrollment as follows:

Eastern department camps	15,000
Central department camps	7,000
Southern department camps	2,000
Western department camps	6,000

Total 30,000

We are informed that requests for camps are being made by various States and communities, especially in the Central West, which the War Department can not grant because of a lack of officers and troops.

The Military Training Camps Association is national in scope, and maintains various offices and local committees at a number of points in all sections of the country. It is directed by a governing committee of 50, including representative citizens who have attended the camps and a number of university presidents.

The camps have always had the approval and support of the War Department, but never any legislative recognition or support. The men have paid their own expenses, including transportation and uniforms, the total amounting to an average of at least \$60 per man. The enrollments for the 1916 camps are being made on the same basis, due to lack of any Federal legislation.

The great employers, such as the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., the Western Union Telegraph Co., and the United States Steel Corporation, have offered their cooperation and will grant four weeks' vacation for their employees to attend.

A recent letter from the Secretary of War, indicating his full approval of the training-camp movement, is inclosed. We shall be glad to furnish any further information desired by any Senator.

We have no quarrel with the National Guard. Many of our most active men are National Guardsmen.

We wish only to be given authority to continue our work, in which thousands of men, from coast to coast, are interested.

Yours, respectfully,

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, MILITARY TRAINING CAMPS
ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
By GRANVILLE CLARK, Secretary.

WAR DEPARTMENT.

Washington, D. C., March 16, 1916.

To the Governing Committee of the Military Training Camps Association of the United States.

GENTLEMEN: I heartily approve and indorse the valuable and patriotic service that is being rendered to the country by the Army training camps for civilians.

I believe in the work of these camps, not only from the military point of view but as of value to the Nation educationally in promoting discipline, order, and good citizenship. The camps are exactly in line with the sound policy of reliance upon a citizenry trained to arms as our main safeguard for defense.

I appreciate highly the service rendered by the university presidents and civilian committees who are forwarding this movement.

These camps were originated by the War Department in 1913 for the training of students, and have been since extended for the benefit of other citizens with gratifying results.

You may rest assured that in continuing your work of developing and promoting these camps on a national scale you will have the continued cooperation and support of the War Department.

Yours, most sincerely,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, in connection with the communication tendered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] there is an observation I wish to make with a view of clarifying what appears to be some obscure or certainly confused situation.

The vast number of telegrams which have come into this body indicate that in certain sections of the country there has been expressed the conviction that the Senate on one side or the other is opposing these training camps. I should like to have it clear that there has been no issue in the Senate as to these training camps, and on neither side of the Senate has there been expressed any opposition whatever, and no vote and no debate on either side of the Senate has involved the question.

Since there seems to be a mistaken idea throughout all parts of the country that section 56 involves that question, it is well to have it clear now that up to the present time, I think all Senators on both sides will agree, there has been no opposition whatever expressed to the camps, but every expression of encouragement.

SCIENCE OF HOME ECONOMICS.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in accordance with the notice I gave last evening, I desire to address the Senate for a few moments.

Mr. President, the Senate has been considering for some days past the question of increasing the Army of the United States for the better protection of our country, and I am now going to make a few brief remarks on a bill introduced by me on March 25 providing for an increased annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations, to be used in researches and experiments in home economics and regulating the expenditure thereof, the purpose of which is to better prepare the girls and mothers of our country for the life duties of practically all of them. For the past four years I have been endeavoring to secure favorable action by the Senate on bills of similar import, and sincerely trust that at this session of Congress legislation along the lines outlined in the bill will be enacted into law.

As each year passes the necessity for such legislation becomes more and more apparent. I hope I can have the attention of the Senate for a short time while I give some of the reasons why I have been pressing such legislation and why I believe favorable action should be taken on my bill and at the same time, if possible, on the bill now upon the calendar in which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] and many of us are so deeply interested. Similar bills introduced by me have in the past received the hearty approval of the Department of Agriculture, also the support of hundreds of the leading educators, both men and women, of our country, and of a very great number of women's organizations. I have the letters of indorsement, but will not burden the Record with them. A letter signed by Hon. B. T. Galloway, then Acting Secretary of Agriculture, dated February 14, 1914, addressed to Senator GORE, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, in answer to a request that a report be made on Senate bill 280, contains this statement:

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your recent letter, together with Senate bill 280, providing for an increased annual appropriation for agricul-

tural experiment stations, to be used in researches in home economics, etc. I note your request that a report be made on this bill.

The bill would provide for the experimental study in the agricultural experiment stations of home economics, including both domestic science and domestic art problems; i. e., it would provide for the experimental study of the nature and use in the home of food materials, wool, cotton, and other agricultural products which the housekeeper uses to feed, clothe, and otherwise care for her family and home. It is with such problems that home economics is concerned. The teaching of home economics has already been organized in the agricultural and other colleges and in numerous schools throughout the United States. In recent years the extension movement has been organized on a large scale, and this includes the dissemination and demonstration of information on home economics. The Congress has just passed a bill granting money to all the States for extension work in home economics as well as agriculture. This independent movement for instructions and demonstration in home economics can not be developed properly unless there are back of it agencies for investigation, through which tested, reliable, and new knowledge on the subject may be constantly acquired. There would, therefore, appear to be need for experimental inquiries in home economics at the present time.

The bill S. 280, as drawn, follows practically the language used in the act of March 16, 1906, commonly known as the Adams Act. Since the passage of the Adams Act there has been a material change in public sentiment with regard to the relation of the Federal Government and the States in so far as concerns educational and similar work.

The Hoke Smith-Lever bill, above referred to, lays down a principle which, it seems, should be given due weight in considering any further legislation affecting the agricultural colleges and the State experiment stations. It is a principle involving the equal sharing by the States and the Federal Government of the expenses of the work. We believe this principle should be adopted in connection with the bill under consideration. We believe, furthermore, that the appropriation, if made, should begin with a moderate sum and be cumulative, just as is the case with the Hoke Smith-Lever bill. I have submitted this proposition to some of the leading experiment-stations workers and they for the most part approve the plan. Their comments are submitted herewith as Exhibit A.

It is our view that it would be unwise at this time to make so large an appropriation as \$10,000 to each State. Research in home economics opens a new field. The work, therefore, should be begun in a conservative way. We are of the opinion that \$2,500 would suffice to inaugurate this work, with an additional \$2,500 thereafter for three years, provided the States appropriate an equal amount. In any event, each station would receive \$2,500 from the Federal Government and \$2,500 each year for three consecutive years, provided the States meet the appropriation until the total from the Federal Government would equal \$10,000. Thereafter the appropriation would be \$10,000 annually. Some further changes are made in the bill to make it conform in general to the plan worked out in the Hoke Smith-Lever measure. All these amendments we have brought together in the form of a new bill, which is submitted as Exhibit B. There is also submitted, as Exhibit C, Senate bill No. 280, with the amendments proposed inserted, in order that the committee may see exactly what changes have been made.

I shall be pleased to furnish any additional information if such is required.

Exhibit A, referred to in the letter of the Acting Secretary, consists of letters addressed to him by Hon. Charles E. Thorne, director of the Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station; Hon. F. B. Mumford, dean and director of the College of Agriculture and Experiment Station of the University of Missouri; Hon. A. F. Woods, dean and director of the department of agriculture of the University of Minnesota; and Hon. H. J. Waters, president of the Kansas State Agricultural College, which I ask to have incorporated in the Record at the end of my remarks without reading.

It is generally acknowledged that upon our splendid system of popular education, as much as any other single influence, rests the greatness and glory of our Nation. Notwithstanding the splendid results of our school system, it still falls short of present-day requirements. We should not forget that it is less than 100 years since it was a debatable question in New England whether the State was justified in teaching more than "readin', writin', and cipherin'," and whether it was worth while at all to educate the girls. The change has been gradual; every advance has met with opposition. I predict the day will come when every child in America, rich or poor, will be required by law to have an education and training necessary for a life of usefulness and good citizenship. Our girls must be so educated in order to insure successful homes, which are the basis of all powerful and self-sustaining nations.

The education furnished by our agricultural colleges should be that which will make for the highest and most useful citizenship and best fit the individual for the duties and responsibilities of life that must be met and assumed. As much attention should be given to the preparation and education of the girl as the boy; as much demonstration work taken to the home as is carried to the farm. In order that this may be accomplished our agricultural experiment stations must have the appropriation provided for in my bill so that the necessary researches and experiments can be carried on and the acquired information taken by the demonstrators provided for in the recent Smith-Lever bill.

The question as to whether "it is worth while to educate girls" has been answered unequivocally in the affirmative. In this twentieth century the woman is no longer a mere drudge, a convenience, a something to satisfy the wishes and demands of the man. To-day, in America at least, we find her as counselor and partner, as God intended her to be.

In our struggle for liberty and higher national ideals woman has been our inspiration in the past and is our hope for the future. No matter what woman's aims, her hopes, or ambitions may be, or what avocations she may decide to enter, it will always remain for her to find her greatest reward and happiness as a successful home maker. The most unselfish and holy duties in our existence have been committed by our Heavenly Father to the wife and mother. What shall we think of a person or a people so ignorant or so parsimonious that would deny her any opportunity to fit herself for this special calling? Not only is the individual benefited by an education but the Nation is immensely profited by every one of its citizens receiving a sensible and practical education. Such an education means to a nation better citizenship, unquestioned loyalty, and temporal development. To the individual it means increased chances in obtaining positions of responsibility and power; self-independence; a broader view and conception of life; loftier ideals; greater usefulness to one's self; and greater appreciation for the wonders and beauties of nature. No school, college, or university that fails to fit the individual for the duties and responsibilities of life, that fails to teach morality, thrift, and industry can, in my opinion, be classed as successful. I believe in and am an advocate of vocational education for our boys and a complete home economics course for our girls. Let the student come in contact with the actual affairs of life as well as the theories. Direct their hands and eyes as well as their minds. Teach them not to be idle, "for he that is idle shall not eat the bread, nor wear the garments of the laborer." Impress upon them all that work is honorable.

The household is a unit of social progress. It implies marriage, family, and the home. Household science is so closely related to sociology or human experience in social living that sociologists often make the statement that household science is but an application of their ideals. The home ought to and by right should be the place in which the soul can develop and grow. Contentions, ignorance, wastefulness, idleness, and a lack of harmony retard that development and growth and blunt the finer sensibilities of every inmate of the household. Home economics inspires an interest in home life and daily duties. It stimulates economy, industry, neatness, individuality, and self-control. Knowing this to be true, I hope that nothing will be left undone in providing an opportunity for all American girls of every walk of life to study the real things of life—the fascinating problems of home economics.

I am one who believes that much of the world's poverty, misery, drunkenness, and disease come from poorly prepared food. It is a crime, and is wicked in the sight of God to have the products of the farm made next to useless by poor cooking. Tens of thousands of homes are ruined by helpless and ignorant housekeepers, and the American garbage can is the fattest in all the world. No one questions the fact that the food consumption per capita in America is larger than that of any other country in the world and nearly twice that of thrifty France. The way to lessen these evils is to provide an annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations to be used in researches and experiments in home economics; and if this step is taken by Congress it will not be many years until the same system is established throughout our entire school system. Our present plan of education will be changed, or perhaps I had better say extended, and when that blessed day arrives our schools, colleges, and universities will studiously employ themselves in carrying civilization with all its blessings downward to the girls of the home and the boys and men of the farm. In saying this I do not wish to be understood as meaning there will be a lowering of standards of scholarship, culture, discipline, or research in our future system of education. Such a thing is unthinkable; it can not be, as every course of study will be dedicated to the better preparation of students for the higher and nobler duties of life. Such an education will not only develop a more contented, healthy, loyal, and home-loving people, but it will prevent billions of dollars of waste that is worse than loss to the American homes to-day. I shall briefly refer to some facts we are all familiar with to demonstrate what I mean. It is a well-known fact that the aggregate value of farm products for the year 1913 was placed at \$10,000,000,000 by our Department of Agriculture. The approximate cash income of the farmers of the United States, even in ordinary times, is known to be at least \$5,000,000,000. It is hardly possible for the ordinary mind to grasp the full meaning of \$10,000,000,000, but comparisons are sometimes easier to understand, so I will say that the value of the farm products of the United States in 1913 was twice as great as their value in 1899 and over a billion and a half dollars greater than they were in the year 1909. These figures tell the story as forcibly as it is possible to do of the advancing cost of living, for the volume

of increase of farm crops since 1899 has not kept pace with the increase of values. Any action on the part of organizations or State legislatures, any legislation by Congress that will assist the people in acquiring a knowledge that will prevent the destruction or waste of products of the farm or factory will be the greatest blessing that can be conferred upon the American home and Nation.

We must not forget that the influences that affect the family to a degree affect the Nation. In my opinion, waste and extravagance in their thousand forms are among the curses of the age, and no people upon the face of the earth is so guilty of both of these evils as our own American people. The people of the United States—I bar no class—have been living at a higher and higher standard for the last 15 years. The time has arrived when further advances in the mode of living must cease, and it is really desirous from every point of view for a retrenchment; but I recognize that a return to the old methods of economizing is hardly possible. I know it is a difficult matter for a family either to begin or to determine just where or how to begin to economize. It is so much easier to add comforts to home life than eliminate them. Extravagance and waste, which devour so much of the substance of the people, have much to do with the cost that is severely felt; that is, the cost to people of small means, who find it hard to get on in comfort with such incomes as they possess.

There is a fundamental principle of economics, so simple that it ought to be easily understood, and yet its significance is almost unheeded. It is this: Everything that goes to support life and to satisfy human wants must be continually produced for that purpose by human effort through the employment of capital and labor from the resources of nature. There is only what is thus produced to live upon; that is the supply. It is a question of how much is consumed in living, and it can not be more than the production, at least for any length of time. If products are squandered or wasted or thrown away after they are ready for consumption, the supply will be diminished, while the demand remains the same, and the cost of living will be higher than it would otherwise be. These are not questions of abstract theory, but are elementary facts within the comprehension of any ordinary man. We need to be reminded that whatever goes to waste and extravagance, which is reckoned in terms of money, is not a mere throwing away of dollars or depleting of bank accounts or getting away with inherited or accumulated property. It is using up the fruits of labor, which is going on from day to day. This is exceeding the supply of products and turning from the form of necessities and comforts to those of luxuries. It is largely the voluntary cost of high living that causes the involuntary cost of low living.

In a very short investigation and from sources I have every confidence in, I find that domestic science is not taught in a single one of the following colleges for women: Wellesley, at Wellesley, Mass.; Bryn Mawr, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; Vassar, at Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Mount Holyoke, at South Hadley, Mass.; Smith's, at Northampton, Mass.; and Swarthmore, coeducational, at Swarthmore, Pa. In nearly all of these schools four years of preparatory Latin are positively required. A permit to substitute four years of German for three years of Latin is denied. Perhaps it can be expressed better by saying that these colleges consider proficiency in a dead language of more importance than proficiency in a modern language.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator may be accurate in the list of colleges he has given where household economics are not taught, but it is a fact that I think is undeniable that in the preparatory schools from which the girls go to these colleges they do have training in economics.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true, Mr. President, in almost every State in the Union, but only to a limited degree.

This simply means that our leading schools for girls do not teach the one thing that every girl should be taught, namely, how to manage a home. I am in full sympathy with the splendid work accomplished by our magnificent schools for girls. I believe in the refining influences they exert upon their students. I am an advocate of the highest education possible for woman, but I do believe no woman's education is complete until she knows how to and could, if required, manage a home successfully.

I know you often hear it said college women will not have to do their own work; but will be able, if single or married, to keep household servants. This implies that washing dishes, sweeping and dusting, and cleaning are all there is to house-

keeping. Never was there a greater mistake. Even where the financial condition of the family will allow paying the present high wages, competent servants are few and hard to find. The best servants are those trained by a woman capable of showing them how everything should be done in a well-managed home. The wife of a man with a limited income can make a home happier in proportion to her ability to make the most of every cent she receives and prepare the food for the family in the most tasty and wholesome way. The wife of a wealthy man has even greater opportunities for making the home ideal, but whether it is a home of affluence or poverty it is of the greatest importance that the wife should be capable of properly performing or directing her own household affairs. We can not deny that untold numbers of wives and mothers in this country spend their time and energy in the preparation of the meals for the family without the least knowledge of the nutritive value of the food selected. How humiliating it must be to a wife and how discouraging to a husband to have good, fresh, wholesome food-stuffs made into the most indigestible dishes, and perhaps half the time absolutely ruined by poor cooking.

A few years ago in a bulletin issued in the course of home economics in the University of Wisconsin this statement was made:

More than ten billions are spent in the United States annually for food, shelter, and clothing; that 90 per cent of this vast sum is spent by women who have no adequate knowledge of money values.

It is pointed out that in any other avocation of life the persons entrusted with such expenditures would be required to pass through a rigid system of training. The State is taxed to provide instructions in the principles governing the production of raw material and the manufacture of those raw materials into the finished product. Woman should be trained to use this material so that there will be the least possible waste of time or money and the best results obtained.

The day will come when it will be unpopular for a young girl to boast that she does not know the first thing about house-keeping; that she doubts whether she could boil water without scorching it; and that she never sewed a stitch in her life. If I am mistaken in this prediction, God have mercy on our future American homes! The mothers of any of these same girls would never consent, and I approve of their position, to the marriage of her daughter to a man without preparation or capacity for making a living and providing a home for her; yet she would not think it improper on her part to let that daughter marry a good, honest, hard-working man with absolutely no knowledge of how to take care of a home.

The alarming increase in divorce, in wrecked homes, in increased doctor bills, is due to ignorance of woman's highest responsibilities. The press and magazines of the country are filled with articles advocating legislation for the better education of our boys. Plans for improving our present educational system are being constantly suggested and adopted. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is often found the expressions of Members of Congress along the same line, the greater part of which I most heartily approve; but we seldom see or hear one word in advocacy of the better preparation and education of our girls. In my opinion, it is just as important that woman should be properly educated as that man should be.

I had the pleasure of spending an evening a short time ago with a very dear friend of mine, a man who has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in general educational work. He remarked that if he was beginning life anew he would interest himself more in the education of girls than of boys, because the mother is the most potent force in the establishment of the highest character of the home.

Let us never forget that good housekeepers have much to do with making ideal and happy homes. I deprecate the growing tendency among the middle and well-to-do class of our girls of classifying domestic work with that done by the most ignorant servants. Home economics in its truest sense stands for culture, science, and art, and requires the broadest kind of general education. There are more real advantages to a people and greater blessings to a home gained through a knowledge of the fundamental principles of home economics than through any other kind of education for woman. Show me the woman who takes a personal interest in the preparation of the food for the home and is not dependent upon a servant to tell her how it should be cooked or served, takes an interest in her flowers and is not afraid to dig in the dirt, and I will show you a woman that is happy and a good wife.

The addition of home economics in the truest form to our educational system must come and will come as soon as it is properly understood by Congress. Increased production from the soil and the problem of properly feeding our ever-increasing numbers will tax the abilities of our statesmen. The passage

of the Smith-Lever bill has assisted the farmers of our country; the passage of Senate bill 5273 will be of untold value to American homes. The Smith-Lever bill provides for the demonstration work; my bill provides for conducting original or confirmatory researches or experiments bearing directly upon home economics, including both domestic science and domestic art, and disseminating the results.

Miss Clement, of New York, highly educated in the culinary art, says:

The wife who can not cook or superintend the housekeeping takes her husband's pay envelope on false pretenses. She does not know her business. When a couple marry, the girl expects her husband to hand her over most of his salary, and he, in turn, expects that her management of that money will make it go as far as possible. It is his business to earn the money. It is hers to spend it. Surely one part is as important as the other. Correct feeding is becoming a science and we are awakening to the fact that it is as important to combine food properly for the adult as it is for the baby. No woman need think that she is too intellectual to bother with cooking. Cooking is a science as well as an art, and one can go on learning forever. The bride who has a good foundation of culinary knowledge and takes an interest in cooking will find no end of possibilities to it. Right in her own kitchen she can join the great movement to reduce the high cost of living. She can use up every scrap of left-over material. It is the clever cook alone who can make left-over food tasty and never waste anything. The smaller the income the more intelligence it takes on the part of the bride to manage her share of the domestic partnership, and the more she needs to study and plan her daily bills of fare. A man comes home after a hard day's work and sees the same old things served, sometimes purchased from a pastry shop just before dinner. If he is easy-going he says nothing, but after a while he grows grouchy. There are more grouches caused by bad cooking than by bad luck.

Every housewife should know the simple food principles underlying their cookery. Knowing this she can give to the family the proper kind of food, prepared in the best way to produce strength, health, and contentment. She raises the standard of the home and the effect can not be other than happier homes which mean better men and women, true and loyal American citizens. I can not understand why girls of the working classes are ashamed to confess and rather pride themselves upon their ignorance of the simplest form of cooking. Then, after marriage they bewail their fate if their husbands, tormented by dyspepsia, seek relief at the restaurant or in many cases in strong drink. I have often heard it said and I believe it "that few men abandon or get a divorce from a woman who is a good cook." A great painter was once asked how he mixed his paints. He answered "I mix them with brains." In order to be a successful cook a girl must mix her food with brains. The love of the home, the field, and the garden brings true happiness to a greater number of the human family than the knowledge of dead languages or accumulated wealth. If you would be truly cultivated associate with plants and flowers, with babies and home folks.

The servant-girl problem is one that is always with us and will be until home economics becomes as much a part of our educational system as the studies in the higher grades of our district schools. Lively discussions have taken place by intelligent women with a view of solving this problem for the benefit of the housekeeper who is sorely tried with incompetent help. I desire to say in passing that in my opinion much of the complaint of incompetency can be traced to the incompetent housewife, but I sympathize with both parties—the woman who hired and paid for work that was done unsatisfactorily and being at the mercy of the girl who did not know how to do her work, and also the girl who was obliged "to work out" to make her living, and, try as she would, she could not give satisfaction, being human, having high aspirations that were born in her, and still feeling that she was an underling and in many cases looked upon with contempt. A perfect system of education is the only way to correct this widespread, unfortunate, and destructive system.

There is nothing in this world of more importance than the daily supply of food. The family meal should consist of a reasonable variety, must be regularly provided, and ought to be suitably and properly cooked. This standard must be attained in order to reach the highest degree of happiness and contentment. Every girl should be taught what to eat, how to eat, and how to cook. In order for us to live we must eat, and the question of healthful and nutritious food is a very important one of life. Providence designed eating to be no inconsiderable part of our daily requirements. An old lady about to pass to her future reward was asked while on her deathbed by her pastor which of all the divine mercies she was most thankful for at such a time, and she replied: "Well, I have always enjoyed my victuals." Home economics teaches all that is necessary to know about the sanitation of the home, the absolute need of cleanliness in every part of the home, in the cellar, the garret, and particularly every corner of the home. It shows the value of ventilation, light, and warmth, and the best methods of securing them. It points the way to make the home and all

its surroundings tasteful, comfortable, healthful. Every girl should be taught to cut, fit, and, with her own hands, make the ordinary clothing commonly used in the family. If I had a dozen daughters and was able to give each of them a million dollars the day of her marriage, I would still want each one to know how to cook, make her own clothes, and, in fact, be a superior housekeeper. It is far better for the child that a father be a worthless nonentity than the mother. Girls should educate and prepare themselves for the higher duties of life.

Mr. Robert J. Shores, essayist, once known to me as Bob Shores, the reporter, in his new book entitled "New Brooms" capably presents, by a pretended cook, a world of philosophy on the subject in the following brief passage:

I do not believe, as many seem to believe, that every man or woman who can juggle a skillet or wield an egg beater is a cook. Merely to follow a formula in a cookery book does not make one a cook any more than compounding a prescription makes one a physician. Cooking is an art as well as a science. The violinist can not express his personality in the strains of his instrument more fully than can the cook in his cooking. The favorite dishes of a race are characteristic of that race. The Spaniard, like his chili con carne and his tamale, is hot, peppery, and economical. The Frenchman, like his many concoctions, is full of spice, imagination, and extravagance. The Italian is indolent and averse to exertion, as is evidenced by his macaroni and spaghetti. The Englishman is red and hearty like his roast beef. The German is fat and fair like his sausages. The Russian is odd and interesting like his caviar. The American, like his diet, is cosmopolitan.

And as the cooking of a nation or a race is characteristic of that nation or race, so the cooking of an individual is characteristic of that individual. Coarse people do not prepare dainty dishes. * * * If there be the feeblest spark of charity in a man's breast, a good dinner will fan it into flame. A bad dinner, on the other hand, will bring to the surface all that is mean and ignoble in his nature. Indigestion, I surmise, has been the cause of most of the cruelty of men. Viewing history in this light, it is easier to understand the apparently wanton slaughter among barbarians. Fed upon ill-conditioned food, the barbarian is attacked in his most sensitive part—his stomach. * * * It is to be observed that the science of cookery and the progress of civilization advance together. Well-fed men are slow to wrath and easily appeased. At the height of the Roman civilization the Romans became epicures and ceased to be warriors. War has no charms for the man who is at peace with his own stomach.

With the proper management housekeeping ceases to be a drudgery and becomes the highest, broadest, and most ennobling occupation for a woman. It is in no sense circumscribed in effort, energy, or talent. There is no bigger business in the world than home making in the sense that there is none more important, none more essential to the welfare of the race. History teaches us that the dominant nations of this world have attained their strength gradually, reached maturity, became diseased, and died. It is worth while to call attention to the fact that nearly every one of such nations has traveled the same road in attaining greatness and has died from the same cause. Most of the world powers have in their early history been agricultural countries and derived their manhood from the farm and their womanhood from the home. As wealth and power increased, so did the neglect of the farm and the home. Great cities were built and became the centers of commerce, social and political activities. To maintain these activities the best men of the nation were drawn to those centers. Extravagances and excesses became the rule; vice and corruption began to creep in; the home and children considered a burden; patriotism and the race began to weaken; the fertility and products of the soil decreased; the consumption of the cities increased; the cost of living rose higher and higher; discontent became universal; stronger races, living nearer to nature and God's laws, found it easy to capture or destroy the diseased nation. The death is traceable to the decay of the home and the abandonment of the farm. God grant that if the germ of this same disease is finding its way into our national life Congress will do all it can to stop and destroy it; and, in my opinion, the best way to begin it is to instruct and demonstrate to the women of our country the advantages of maintaining a clean, cheerful, and contented home, and our men the independence and profitable avocation of an intelligent farmer.

EXHIBIT A.

OHIO AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION.

WOOSTER, OHIO, February 2, 1914.

Hon. B. T. GALLOWAY,
Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have yours of the 29th, and am pleased to learn of the institution of such a measure as that of Senator SMOOT. This measure is a necessary adjunct to the Lever bill. It is a matter of history that the agricultural colleges failed to find themselves until the experiment stations had begun to accumulate a fund of definite information in agricultural science, and it is to be expected that before the colleges of agriculture can effectively furnish the instruction and demonstrations in domestic science required by the Lever bill a similar fund of information must be accumulated through such scientific research as the experiment stations are prepared to conduct.

While it is eminently proper that all work allied to teaching should be conducted by the colleges, it is equally proper that all lines of scientific research and experiment should be conducted by the experiment stations.

As to the amount of the appropriations, I am inclined to agree with you that it would be better to begin with a smaller amount than \$10,000. My own suggestion would be \$2,500 for the first year, with an increase of a like amount each year for three successive years, following somewhat after the plan of the Lever bill in this respect.

I fully agree that the State should be required to meet the national appropriation with a similar sum. The history of the Hatch and Adams Acts shows that many States have been disposed to shift all responsibility for such work on to the National Government, and I do not believe this a good thing for the State or the institution.

I think it would be necessary for the expenditure of this fund to be supervised by the national department, as that of the Hatch and Adams funds are. It will sometimes be difficult to draw the line between work in domestic science and that in general agriculture.

This station is already expending annually nearly or quite as much in work that would properly come under the scope of the proposed bill as that measure contemplates.

Thanking you for the information you have given respecting this measure, I am,

Yours, respectfully,

CHAS. E. THORNE, Director.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI,
Columbia, February 3, 1914.

Dr. B. T. GALLOWAY,
Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. GALLOWAY: I have your letter of January 29 and a copy of bill introduced by Senator SMOOT. The bill is a worthy measure. There is undoubtedly a large need for fundamental investigations in the whole range of subjects included in the general term, "home economics." A fund for investigation in home economics will stimulate the teaching and practical application of this subject as much as investigations in agriculture have stimulated teaching and practical application in agricultural subjects.

I am in favor of making the Federal appropriations conditional upon State appropriations. The people themselves must have a direct interest in public activities, and the surest way to interest them and to win their support and prepare them for taking advantage of the investigations conducted and the teaching offered is to support in whole or in part these activities by direct taxation.

It would seem to me that an initial appropriation of \$5,000 a year, which is conditional upon the appropriation of an equal amount by the States, would be sufficient for a good beginning and could be efficiently administered through the present experiment station organization.

Very truly, yours,

F. B. MUMFORD.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
University Farm, St. Paul, February 6, 1914.

Dr. B. T. GALLOWAY,
Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. GALLOWAY: I am very much interested in the bill introduced by Senator SMOOT (S. 280) to provide for an increased annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations to be used in research in home economics. I think the general idea of the measure is timely and good. There is certainly a need for research work bearing upon home economics. A measure of this kind would stimulate special interest and undoubtedly result in great good. I believe, however, that it would be better to start with an appropriation of \$2,500 from the Government, given on condition of a similar appropriation by the State, and increasing each year until it reaches \$10,000, making a total of \$20,000, including the amount appropriated by the State. The general plan of the Lever bill should, in my opinion, be followed. In section 2 of the measure, line 10, I would cut out the phrase "at least once in six months" in the requirement of publication of bulletins, and I would modify the statement regarding the distribution to "each newspaper" to read "copies should be sent to the various newspapers of the State," as it would hardly be practicable to discover each newspaper. Otherwise I think the measure is a good one.

Thanking you very much for sending me a copy, and with kindest regards, I am,

Very truly, yours,

A. F. WOODS,
Dean and Director.

KANSAS STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE,
Manhattan, February 9, 1914.

Dr. B. T. GALLOWAY,
Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DR. GALLOWAY: Your letter of January 29, in relation to Senator SMOOT's bill seeking further to endow the experiment stations, came during my absence from the office. I have just had time to go over the matter.

I think the bill is an excellent one and should receive our heartiest support. There are some details that might need attention, but these could be handled in the hearing on the matter. I question the advisability of requiring the States to meet half of the expense, especially following immediately upon the heels of the Lever bill. I believe we could rely upon the States doing their share within a very few years, as they are now doing in supporting the work started under the Hatch fund.

With best wishes, I am,
Very cordially, yours,

H. J. WATERS,
President.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HARDWICK. I move to amend the amendment, in line 17, page 2, by striking out the words "and useful in the manufacture of fertilizers."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On line 17, page 2, it is proposed to strike out the words "and useful in the manufacture of fertilizers."

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I desire to speak on the amendment now before the Senate. It is something of an anticlimax from the highly elevating speech of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to come to the commonplace subject of nitric acid.

I feel it a duty to say a few words concerning the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. The amendment of the Senator from Alabama is not as yet before the Senate, but the two amendments are very closely related and can be discussed together.

I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and voted to report out the bill—now the amendment—of the Senator from South Carolina. I am not altogether satisfied with it, and am not altogether satisfied with the statement in the report that full and complete hearings were had. The matter was rather rushed along—I say this in no spirit of criticism—by the Senator from South Carolina with an enthusiasm and power that would indicate that in times of trouble, if we could multiply the Senator of South Carolina many times, we would not need much of a factory for the production of dynamic force. It was thought that the question should come out for a full discussion upon the floor.

I rather wish that the Senator from South Carolina would not press this amendment at this time, and that the Senator from Alabama would not press his amendment, as amendments to this bill. This bill is for the reorganization of the Army; no other propositions should be attached to it unless necessary.

The question of a plant for the fixation of nitrogen from the atmosphere for the development of fertilizers does not seem to be exactly in harmony with the purpose of this bill, and I think it ought to come up here for a free discussion as an independent proposition. But the Senator from South Carolina has in his good judgment seemed to believe that there was a better opportunity to secure what he believes is necessary and what we all realize is important, some way of developing a sufficient supply of nitric acid in time of war, and so, as I understand it, he insists upon his amendment to this bill being considered now.

I wish to suggest to the Senator from South Carolina that he should change his amendment in one respect at least. As the amendment now stands in the copy before me the Secretary of War is given all this power. I do not like that. I think the War Department through its Board of Army Engineers is absolutely committed to one power site in this country. This measure comes from the Agricultural Committee. It is partially an agricultural proposition. The Secretary of Agriculture would be a very proper party to join with the Secretary of War in this project. I think an amendment to that effect would be in the third degree or I should offer the amendment, but I make the suggestion to the Senator from South Carolina as he can perfect his amendment in that way. I should feel much more like voting for this proposition if the Secretary of Agriculture was included.

Mr. President, if we must come to a choice between the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and that of the Senator from South Carolina I shall feel it my duty to vote for the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina, but do wish that they could be absolutely divorced from this bill, because they do not belong here; and one of the means by which bad legislation is so often accomplished is to place amendments upon bills that while possibly germane ought to be considered as independent propositions.

Again, Mr. President, I have a little doubt in my mind about the success of these various processes. We tried to find out something about it from the War Department and from the Navy Department. I do not believe that the War Department or the Navy Department have as yet made a sufficient investigation to be absolutely certain about these processes. I am not here to dispute the statement of the distinguished Senator from Alabama as to the absolute necessity, as we are at present advised, of taking some steps in any plan of preparedness, for the manufacture of nitric acid. It is a marvelous thing that we can get out of the air what may be essential for the development of this very necessary war material. But I do take some issue with the proposition which seems to be accepted by various Senators, that the processes so far as they have been developed are the best that we can look for or that the last word has been given us by the chemists in regard to this matter. However, I am willing to run some risk on the question, as we must in propositions of this kind. We know not what the future of development along chemical lines may be.

Now, we are met with a statement by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, a few days ago, that section 82 in the House, as the bill was introduced, which is similar to this or

covers the same ground, was defeated by the influence, as I remember the words, of the Powder Trust, the Republican Party, and certain people calling themselves conservationists. I hold no brief for the Powder Trust and have no particular love for the Powder Trust. I have spent some hard weeks of my life in working on briefs against the Powder Trust. I do have some love for the Republican Party, and am sorry to see it coupled up with the Powder Trust even in accusation. But charges like that, of course, are easy to be made; however, coming from such a distinguished source they are entitled to consideration and should be investigated. I trust they may be.

On the other hand, it was freely charged in the House, if I may refer to that, that those supporting section 82 of that bill were influenced by the Water Power Trust or that representatives thereof had been active in its support. So we have ourselves in the situation of the Powder Trust on one hand and the Water Power Trust on the other hand, and if I may be permitted to borrow a phrase of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE], "God pity us under those circumstances." I want to see an investigation of both charges. Possibly when trusts fall out the Government may know the truth.

Now, this comes along here as a preparedness proposition.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LODGE. Simply for a question. The Senator referred to section 82 of the House bill. He means section 82 of the bill as introduced, not as it comes to us?

Mr. KENYON. Section 82 of the bill introduced. I thank the Senator. I think I so stated heretofore.

This comes along now as a proposition for preparedness. Nearly everything that has been introduced here at this session has been something in relation to preparedness. I sometimes wonder where it is going to stop. We spent five weeks on a power-dam bill. It was insisted that it was a question of preparedness. We passed from that to another power-dam bill, and that was a question of preparedness. Now we seem to have another dam proposition. It seems as if we have just one dam bill after another. Everything is under the cloak of preparedness. I think my colleague [Mr. CUMMINS] suggested the other day, paraphrasing the phrase "O Liberty! Liberty! how many crimes are committed in thy name?" by "Preparedness, how many?" Not all crimes by any means; but "preparedness" now seems to be the vehicle to carry everything through Congress.

The child-labor bill is, I think, a good preparedness measure, and likewise a rural-credits bill. I suppose when the river and harbor bill comes along every appropriation for Podunk Creek will be for preparedness, and when the public-buildings bill comes along every appropriation for a public building will be for preparedness.

I have a letter from a citizen who moved away from my State a good many years ago. It is along that line, and I have had it copied and will read it. I will not give the name of the town, but it illustrates how all legislation now apparently is to get ready against the invader whose foot some can almost feel upon our shores and shows a conception of the general situation shared in by many of our countrymen.

DEAR SENATOR: As a former resident of your State, I make bold to write you concerning one feature of preparedness to which Congress does not seem to be paying the attention it should, and that is the question of appropriations for public buildings. I know you have in the past opposed items in the public buildings bill for public buildings in small towns.

Now, my dear Senator, please don't do so any more. We are expecting a public building in our town. Our Member of Congress promised it to us during the campaign and we are entitled to it. Besides, think of what it may mean along the lines of preparedness. The public buildings to be constructed in the future should be constructed as a sort of fort. A round building is just as feasible as a square one for post-office purposes; then, when we are at the front fighting the battles of our country our wives and children can stay in the public building, if it is constructed as a fort, and we will feel that they are safe from foreign invaders.

If you are really a lover of your country do not oppose any appropriations for public buildings. Of course, if you intend to side against your country and sympathize with its foes and be untrue to the flag that means so much to us, then we can not expect any help from you in securing our public building.

Truly yours,

[Laughter.]

I have not given the place or the name. It is as well to omit them.

Mr. President, this question of preparedness in securing nitrogen for nitric acid is, of course, an important one. We are dependent now upon securing saltpeter or sodium nitrate from Chile. Germany has found itself able in this war to develop some plan. I do not believe anyone knows what that plan is and I do believe that that plan ought to be investigated, if it is

possible and if war is not so imminent for us, before we do settle down to any system in this country.

Nor am I so alarmed about the proposition that we must at once secure a plant for the manufacture of nitric acid. Dr. Baekeland, who was before our committee, said that the chemists of this country could become active; that they could through steam development take care of the question in an emergency, and experts of the Navy Department said that they kept enough of the Chilean product for a year of any kind of an ordinary war, whatever that may be.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That was for anything except war.

Mr. KENYON. I understood him to say that it would cover any kind of an ordinary war, but I may be mistaken.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I thought it was for ordinary service outside of war.

Mr. KENYON. The evidence was not taken down, as the Senator remembers, but in any event the Navy Department provides itself with a very large supply of the Chilean product for any cases of emergency. Possibly not enough for a year of war. It would be hard to determine, of course, how much was essential.

I believe in the Government doing this work, and building and operating the plant, because I believe that the Government should make its munitions of war. I voted for the armor-plate bill on that theory. The profits should be taken out of war, and there would be less demand for war in certain quarters.

Now, as to the fertilizer proposition, I am as much interested in that as the Senator from South Carolina. Of course we do not need as much fertilizer in Iowa for our soil as they need in South Carolina. All this nitrogen out of the air or any fertilizer I do not think could make the soil of South Carolina anywhere near as fertile as the soil of Iowa, but at the same time I am anxious that the Southern States, without such good soil, shall have their fertilizer, and I am willing that the Government shall do that, although the more I see of the Government going into business the less enthusiastic I become about the proposition. The Government does not seem to be able to run its own business, to say nothing of going into other businesses. If there is any general indictment that could be drawn against the Government it is the absolute lack of efficiency in carrying on its own affairs. The question of the conservation of our soil is as important a question as the people of this Nation have to face. And so I am inclined to vote for a Government plant to make nitric acid in war and fertilizer in peace.

I know the minute you talk about this you bump up against the Constitution, and I expected that my friend from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] would get up and ask me something about it. I am glad he has not, because I realize there are some constitutional difficulties in the proposition. There are more constitutional difficulties in the proposition than there are in the child-labor bill which my friend from South Carolina has so strongly urged as unconstitutional.

Mr. President, as to whether or not these various processes are a success was discussed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and I can not add anything to that, but I want to put into the RECORD some statements about it simply for information. Mr. Washburn, of whom we have heard a great deal and whose pamphlets drop upon us mornings like the manna of intelligence in our sphere of ignorance, delivered an address before the American Electro-Chemical Society on this subject. It was subjected after his delivering it to a good deal of discussion. I want to place some of those statements in the RECORD without reading all of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

Mr. KENYON. I will read what Mr. Leland L. Summers said:

Personally I do not accept the unqualified statement in regard to the success of the cyanamid process that Mr. Washburn puts forth, because, while it has been successful, I do not think that engineers by any means accept it as the final word in nitrogen fixation.

Then I insert also remarks of Dr. C. W. Bennett on the same subject:

No one denies that the preparation of cyanamid is the cheapest working process for the fixation of nitrogen. Nitrogen from cyanamid, however, is not as cheap as nitrogen from other sources. We must all admit that by-product ammonia can be placed on the market as ammonium sulphate at a profit for very much less, approximately one-fourth the selling price of cyanamid. This industry, as is pointed out in another communication, is increasing steadily in this country and in others, and it will take the development of only a few other by-products to enormously increase the output of by-product ammonia. * * * No process in operation to-day for the fixation of nitrogen, as has been pointed out a number of times, can hope to compete with by-product ammonia. In drawing conclusions we can not compare alone the processes for the fixation of nitrogen, but we must also compare the

price of the product in question prepared from other sources, because the final user does not care whether his ammonia comes from the distillation of coal or from atmospheric nitrogen.

Mr. Summers says in his comprehensive paper on Fixation of Atmospheric Nitrogen:

It would be hopeless to attempt to put this acid (derived from fixation of atmospheric nitrogen) into a product to compete with fertilizer prices, for they are some 50 per cent lower. * * * It is useless to look only to cheap power as a solution of this problem, as the real solution is in the improvement of processes (p. 373).

I insert also the remarks of Dr. L. H. Baekeland:

USELESS EXPENSE IN MARKETING, NOT MANUFACTURING.

We have heard the statement that in many cases it is more expensive to buy fertilizer than to have a low yield per acre. This is very true; and if the price of fertilizer gets too high, a low yield per acre becomes practically unavoidable. Unfortunately, in this country we are almost everywhere confronted with the detrimental economic condition of too many middlemen. * * * The time will come * * * when you will no longer speak about an excess of ammonia production in gas or coke ovens. There will not be such a thing as excess of ammonia. All ammonia will be saved.

During this discussion of Mr. Washburn's paper the secretary of the society, Joseph W. Richards, said:

Mr. Landis, chief technologist of the American Cyanamid Co. (Mr. Washburn's), has said that his company confidently expects radical changes in nitrogen fixation processes in the next 5 or 10 years, and that it is prepared, if necessary, to scrap its whole plant inside of 20 years, thinking there might very possibly be no cyanamid process in use at that time. (P. 405.)

Dr. Summers said:

Dr. Peacock's paper is very much to the point. Undoubtedly you all know that Dr. Peacock is one of the best authorities in America on fertilizer. * * * is thoroughly familiar with everything that has been connected with the use of nitrogen in fertilizers.

As a commercial undertaking nitrogen fixation must remain substantially dormant so long as the ammonia produced as a by-product of coal distillation remains of such relative amount that it is capable of controlling the rewards of capital invested in nitrogen fixation. It may be accepted as a fact that no nitrogen fixation method has as yet been publicly proposed which can produce nitrogen as cheaply as coal by-product of ammonia.

Gen. Crozier, when before the House Committee on Military Affairs, testified that there were two ways of getting nitric acid independently of the outside sources of supply: one by the use of ammonia, which is one of the by-products of coke making, gotten from coke ovens. He could not say the extent to which we could rely on that, but said it was chemically possible to produce it in that way and there was a good deal of the coke-making industry in this country. He did say the best reliance would be upon the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen, which requires a very considerable amount of cheap electric power in order to compete with the imported nitrate. He said that the expense of manufacturing nitric acid by the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen is not prohibitive if we consider even steam power, if water power can not be obtained at all; that anybody would have difficulty in surviving, commercially, in competition with the imported article.

There are two processes, he states, one the arc process and the other known as the cyanamid process. The cyanamid process requires less horsepower than the arc process, but it requires other expenses in addition, so there is a difference of opinion as to which would ultimately be the cheaper.

In view of the right of control of the Federal Government of the sources of water power, it ought to be possible to permit their development by private parties, under such conditions of consent that the Government would be assured of their utilization for military purposes when needed, at a reasonable cost, and as the great bulk of the output of the plants would be for commercial purposes it would not appear that the Government should itself embark in this development and production.

There should be provision made, he says, that if the Government cooperated with private plants the cooperation should be accompanied by the condition that the Government should have sufficient hold on these plants to insure that it could get what it wanted at reasonable prices, both in times of peace and of war.

Some one asked on yesterday about the effect on the atmosphere of the taking of the nitrogen from it. At the hearings of the Agricultural Committee a gentleman from my State, who is a good deal of a mathematician and interested in this subject, was present and asked me to ask Dr. Baekeland that question when he was on the stand. I did so, and the Doctor cast it aside rather flippantly, saying that 1 acre of air would be sufficient for all the nitrogen we would ever desire. My friend when traveling through the South wrote me a letter from Charleston about it. He said:

Being of a somewhat mathematical turn of mind, I thought I would do a little figuring in regard to the amount of nitrogen in the air. It is a well-known fact that at sea level the pressure of the air on the earth's surface is 15 pounds per square inch. That would make 2,160 pounds per square foot or 1.08 tons of 2,000 pounds each. Multiply by 43,560 square feet per acre and we have 47,044.8 tons. Multiply this by 640, the number of acres in a square mile, and we have 30,108,672 tons, the weight of the air on a square mile of the earth's surface. If I remember correctly the air is four-fifths nitrogen and one-fifth oxygen, and they must necessarily be of the same specific gravity or they would not mix and stay mixed in the proper propor-

tion to sustain animal life. By taking four-fifths of the weight of the air we find that there will be 24,086,937.6 tons of nitrogen in the air pressing on the surface of 1 square mile of the earth.

I have not verified the figures, but I know the man as a thoughtful, painstaking man, and the figures are very surprising. In the Washington Herald a few days ago, as bearing on the question as to whether we have reached anything that is certain about this nitrogen proposition, a little item struck me. In speaking of the battle of Verdun this correspondent says:

These great guns seem to know that back in Germany the scientists have discovered substitutes for gunpowder and nitric acid and they seem to be celebrating their independence of the blockade, for at times hundreds of them resemble nothing so much as troops answering the roll call.

In times of trouble we certainly would not be so absolutely helpless as has been pictured here. American chemistry and American ingenuity would find some way, as Germany has found, to handle the question. I do not say this in any way to indicate that I do not fully realize the necessity of our Government being in condition to command an adequate supply of nitric acid in case of war.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to his colleague?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. CUMMINS. The question I shall now ask is purely for information. It has been stated many times that cheap water power was necessary in order to compete with the Chilean nitrates, but I assume that the nitrogen of the air could be fixed with steam power just the same as with water power. I should like to know if the examination before the committee indicated or developed the kind of machinery or apparatus necessary to take the power and complete the process?

Mr. KENYON. It did not.

Mr. CUMMINS. My question is based on the idea that in time of war, if we should have it speedily, a question of cost would not be so material, and I ask whether we could take steam power anywhere without much delay and prepare for the use of the process?

Mr. KENYON. I am not prepared to answer the Senator, because that fact was not developed before our committee. I rather gather that it would take considerable changes to develop the process.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me to make a brief statement in his time without involving his right to the floor?

Mr. KENYON. I do not want to lose the floor.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That was the reason I put my question in that form. I should like to state that the process by which steam power is used in the extraction of nitrogen is, of course, exactly the same as where water power is used. In the transformation of the energy produced, the nitrogen from the air, the apparatus would be identically the same. Now, if the Senator will allow me, I want to read just a few lines from the two individuals in this country upon whom—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will take occasion to say, reminding the Senator from Iowa of the rule which seems to have been established, that he must be his own judge as to whether or not the Senator from South Carolina is asking a question or is proceeding to a discussion.

Mr. KENYON. I think the rule to which the Chair refers is a very salutary one. I should be glad to have the suggestion of the Senator from South Carolina, but I believe that I would forfeit the floor if I should permit the Senator to speak in my time. If the Senator from South Carolina will put his suggestion in the form of a question, very well.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I would not have the Senator forfeit the floor, but I wished to make the suggestion right at this point, as I was afraid that the Senate might be misled regarding the process. I shall, however, in my own time state it.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, we are confronted with the two amendments. If I vote for the Smith amendment, as I rather expect to if a change is made in it, I shall do so knowing it does not compel the Government, as I understand it, to spend the money. If the Government is not satisfied as to the processes it need not go ahead. The Underwood proposition, it seems to me—though I may be mistaken about it, because the Senator from Alabama says not, and I have the greatest respect for his judgment and ability, of course—but it seems to me that under the amendment of the Senator from Alabama we might just as well write into the amendment that this plant is to be located at one particular place, and that is Muscle Shoals.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator allow me to ask him to tell us why he says that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. KENYON. I am going to try to state just exactly what the Senator from Georgia asks me to do. I want to marshal the evidence on the proposition made. I do not want to misjudge anybody, and have nothing to say about anybody or any reflection to make on anybody.

If Muscle Shoals is the great water power which it is pictured to us to be, it may be entirely true that Muscle Shoals is the proper place for the location of one of the plants. If it is, I have absolutely no objection to the location there; but I want that determined by some board that is not already committed to the proposition, and determined by a board on which there will be some scientists and somebody who has the fertilizer interest at heart as well as the war question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to make a statement for the information of the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator for a question, but I do not want to lose my right to the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. My interruption will take but a moment. I want to state on this floor that there is not a single engineer on this board that ever had anything to do with the Muscle Shoals proposition except one.

Mr. KENYON. And that engineer is the one who has just recently overruled one of the other engineers on the Missouri River proposition, as I understand it—I may be in error on that, however.

Mr. BANKHEAD. His name is Newcomb. I repeat, he is the only one who has ever had anything to do with the proposition.

Mr. KENYON. This amendment recites that this matter shall be handled by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War. They are authorized and directed, first, to hold hearings and conduct negotiations for the purpose of determining upon a suitable air nitrogen process. It must occur to anybody at the inception of reading that amendment, why should this be limited to an investigation of a suitable air process? Why not investigate a steam process or any other process?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. KENYON. I yield for a question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire to ask a question. If steam is used, it is still an air process of obtaining nitrogen, is it not?

Mr. KENYON. It comes out of the air, of course, but this is the air process. It may be that the steam process is covered; perhaps the Senator is correct; I am inclined upon reflection to think he is, but I think it should be broadened a little to cover everything and every process. That is what I am insisting upon first. Of course, the process is out of the air. This amendment provides:

Second, to select a suitable site on a navigable stream in the United States for the construction of the necessary dam, locks, substructure, power house, and hydroelectric equipment.

The Board of Engineers is there given the power to select the site. This amendment provides for only one site. The Smith amendment provides, I think, for four or five different plants, and I say that the Board of Engineers of Rivers and Harbors have committed themselves—perhaps not all of these engineers, but as a board—to the Muscle Shoals project, not as a nitrogen proposition—for that had not been thought of at that time—but as a power proposition in connection with navigation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does the Senator mean that the Board of Engineers has reached the conclusion that the Muscle Shoals power is the best power east of the Mississippi River?

Mr. KENYON. I will refer to the document in a moment or two and see just what they have decided. The Government gave a land grant of 400,000 acres of land to Alabama to build, as I understand, two canals at Muscle Shoals. We have expended there, as a navigation proposition, something like four million dollars. I understand that of the last lump appropriation \$150,000 was allotted by the engineers for borings at Muscle Shoals, although Mr. Washburn, before our committee, practically stated that the navigation project there was of no use.

The Muscle Shoals development has been in Congress as a river and harbor proposition; it has been in Congress as a military proposition; it has been before committees as a fertilizer proposition. If Muscle Shoals is the proper site for these enterprises, and that is determined by a commission or a board who will take every question into consideration, I am not here to say a word against Muscle Shoals; but if that is the place in contemplation, let us have it so stated in black and white.

Its advocates certainly can not be accused of lack of persistence. I follow my line of evidence along. Mr. Worthington, who is president of the Muscle Shoals Hydroelectric Co. and director of several other companies to which I will refer, is referred to in the Decatur Daily, of Decatur, Ala., of March 9, 1916, and an article which I wish to read winds up with his statement. This is from the paper at Florence:

FLORENCE, ALA., March 9.

That Florentines have unlimited faith in Muscle Shoals development was conclusively proven at a mass meeting held in the courthouse at Florence last night when the circuit court room was taxed to its capacity.

The Muscle Shoals finance committee asked for \$2,500, which was subscribed as fast as the secretaries, H. A. Bradshaw and W. H. Mitchell, could take the names of the contributors. This brought the Florence donation for the furtherance of the Muscle Shoals development up to \$10,000 during the last few months. This money is being used to defray the expenses of those actively engaged in the oversight of the public's interest in this all-important project.

R. T. Simpson, president of the commercial club, introduced Col. C. W. Ashcraft, who said people from one end of this country to the other are talking Muscle Shoals. Instead of impoverishing other sections, as is often the case in big enterprises, our progress in the Muscle Shoals development is the progress of every section of the United States. It stands head and shoulders above everything else in Washington. Many of the important congressional committees are considering it simultaneously.

The speaker complimented the Shields bill and said it removes obstacles that have heretofore existed. He declared our "preparedness" is our salvation. The surveys and plans for Muscle Shoals development are made, and it stands 999 chances out of 1,000 to be selected as the site of a Government nitrate plant.

Mr. N. C. Elting, chairman of the finance committee, said, according to this newspaper article: "I presume every man, woman, and child in Lauderdale county is for preparedness. If all had been prepared, the fearful war now raging would never have been." He said the conditions relative to Muscle Shoals are indeed optimistic. He read the following telegrams from Washington:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 7.

N. C. ELTING, Florence, Ala.:

Will you please extend my thanks and hearty feeling of congratulations and encouragement to the courageous, upstanding, constructive people of Florence, and tell them that the bill introduced in the House by the Military Committee authorizing the development of water power and construction of atmospheric nitrogen nitric-acid plants, and Chairman HAY, in his report on the bill, in part says:

"The committee consider this question of the first importance in the consideration of preparedness for national security." Our efforts supported by the lead of Florence secured the authorization for the proposed development, and if Florence will stand pat, put up and see us through, we will get these plants. The total development with fertilizer plants established to cost \$50,000,000.

J. W. WORTHINGTON.

On March 7 he sent this telegram:

WASHINGTON, March 7, 1916.

N. C. ELTING, Florence, Ala.:

Vote on Shields bill will not be taken until to-morrow and probably not until Thursday. Its passage is conceded.

J. W. WORTHINGTON.

These statements were set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some time ago and as they have not been denied we are warranted in accepting them.

Now, who is Mr. Worthington? The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] yesterday inserted in the RECORD some of the connections of these various people. Mr. Worthington, who sent this dispatch concerning Muscle Shoals, I understand is the president of the Muscle Shoals Hydroelectric Power Co., director of the American Cyanamid Co., director of the Alabama Power Co., director of the Alabama Interstate Power Co., director of the Little River Power Co. The Alabama Traction, Light & Power Co. is the parent of the Muscle Shoals & Alabama Power Co., owning its stock, according to Moody's Manual. Mr. Washburn, who has so kindly appeared before the various committees, is the president of the American Cyanamid Co., of which Mr. Worthington is a director; he is a director of the Muscle Shoals Hydroelectric Co., of which Mr. Worthington is president; a director of the Alabama Light & Power Co. and of the Alabama Traction, Light & Power Co., chairman of the board of the Alabama Power Co., vice president of the Alabama Interstate Power Co., director of the Birmingham, Montgomery & Gulf Power Co., and of the Little River Power Co.—or was until a short time ago, when the matter came up in Congress. It seems that he has recently resigned from a number of these companies.

It is quite evident that he is not a witness with absolutely no self-interest.

Mr. Cooper, who is vice president of the six-million-dollar fertilizer company, known as the Duke Fertilizer Co., is the

general manager of the American Cyanamid Co. The American Cyanamid Co., in their statement of assets, schedule "Founding and propaganda, \$230,589" as a part of their assets. So, we find Mr. Worthington sending a dispatch from Washington that Muscle Shoals stands 999 chances out of 1,000 of getting the nitrate plant; we find Mr. Washburn connected with many kinds of corporations interested in water-power development, and the two, it was charged on the floor of the House, practically control the water power of Alabama through their companies. The report of the Secretary of Agriculture, I think, was to the effect that 87 per cent of the water power of Alabama was controlled by the Alabama Traction, Light & Power Co. We find all this commingling of these interests in this project.

Now, what about Mr. Washburn, and what about the board of engineers being committed to the Muscle Shoals proposition? In 1914 the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army in document No. 20 made a report. The House Committee on Rivers and Harbors had passed a resolution, as I understand, asking for a resurvey of these various propositions. Document No. 20 consists of a letter from Gen. Kingman, of May 18, 1914, to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House. It is in reply to a letter from the chairman, inclosing a copy of the resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of February 24, 1912, requesting the Board of Engineers to review the previous reports or surveys of the Tennessee River. Mr. Worthington, the same gentleman who sends the encouraging dispatch, submitted to the Board of Army Engineers a proposition on the part of the Muscle Shoals Hydroelectric Power Co., signed "J. W. Worthington, President," found on page 76 of this document. This proposition was that Muscle Shoals was to be improved in connection with the Muscle Shoals Hydro-Electric Power Co. at an estimated cost of \$18,701,000. It was a proposition in connection with which the Army Engineers approved of the Government loaning the money, or furnishing it for the benefit of a private institution to be paid back in annual payments running for 100 years.

Out of this, the amount properly chargeable to navigation, they found, was \$8,575,000. The remainder was the amount chargeable to power development. The board advised that this was the proper thing for the United States to do, and just a short time later this same engineer advised that in the case of the Great Falls project out here, in which the whole city of Washington was interested, financial conditions were too close to do anything with it. I shall not take the time to put his statements as to that in the RECORD. Evidently he did not regard Great Falls as comparable with Muscle Shoals.

Evidently the matter of nitric acid had not been thought of so seriously at the time this proposition was up to take care of Muscle Shoals, nor after this, when the question came up in the other branch of Congress of appropriating the \$150,000 which the engineers said in this report ought to be immediately done so that the work should not stop. That question was fought out on the floor of the House and defeated.

I want to read just one or two little things from the report of these Army engineers who fathered this most remarkable attempt of the Government to help a great private company that had a monopoly, that owned the power sites, as I shall show from the evidence, they and their associates now owning all the patents on this process, and before the committee Mr. Washburn said substantially that they did not propose that anybody should ever compete with them.

After its exhaustive study and full discussion of this subject the special board concludes with the recommendation that the United States undertake this improvement in connection with the Muscle Shoals Hydro-Electric Co. under certain conditions specified:

"The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has carefully considered this plan, and is in general accord with the views and recommendations of the special board. The project contemplates primarily the conservation of one of the great natural resources of the Nation by the development of power in large amount and incidentally the improvement for navigation throughout the year of a reach of about 82 miles of the Tennessee River. An expenditure by the United States of \$18,701,000 within a period of five years is contemplated. Of this total \$8,575,000 is estimated as the cost of the portion of the work which properly may be considered as an improvement of navigation."

The Board of Engineers says:

As this is the first project recommended for cooperation of the United States with power interests in river work on a very large scale, the board invites attention to the unusual demands such work will make upon the public funds. The development and utilization of the power of the streams of the United States will require an investment of great sums of money, and to insure the required continuity of action through successive lease periods other large sums must be available from time to time. There is little doubt that such investments are justifiable and wise, and that the utilization of this power of the streams now being wasted will increase prosperity in a measure hard to be determined.

If the United States is to have full control and is to guarantee continuity of operation it is apparent that at times it will be called upon, for longer or shorter periods, not possible of being predetermined, to make expenditures comparable with the original sums invested by corporations, and that these expenditures will be returned only after considerable delays, perhaps of years. Whether the annual income of the United States is great enough to supply such large sums, and whether justice to the present generation would warrant such a use of income, are economic questions requiring legislative determination.

The first indication of some regard for the income of the United States that has appeared for some time.

And when one of the engineers was not willing that the Government should pay for the overflow, amounting to \$1,700,000, this board overruled him and decided that the Government should pay even for that.

Following out that chain of evidence, the Board of Army Engineers approving this Muscle Shoals project in the past wanting the Government to advance \$18,500,000 on the proposition, and the Mr. Worthington who made that proposition to the Board of Army Engineers that was accepted being the same party now sending the telegram down to his State that Muscle Shoals is to secure this plant, or has 999 chances out of 1,000 to secure it, I think we are progressing along the line of showing that the Board of Army Engineers ought not alone—and that is all I am insisting on—to determine this proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. KENYON. I do, for a question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator state what the \$18,000,000 was to be spent for? What was to be done with that \$18,000,000?

Mr. KENYON. I did state that, but I can state it better, perhaps, from a souvenir that I hold in my hand of "A visit to the Tennessee River" of a number of Congressmen and Senators to view the Muscle Shoals proposition in May of last year. That is set out in this document, which contains a number of very fine pictures of Senators and Members of Congress. Here was the plan recommended by the United States Engineers in Document No. 20:

United States Engineers' estimate of cost of project, exclusive of equipment and power-house superstructures, \$18,701,000.

Power company's cash contribution, \$3,000,000.

Leaving a total of \$15,701,000.

Total amount chargeable to navigation, as estimated by United States Engineers, \$8,575,000.

Investment of the Federal Government chargeable to power, as estimated by United States Engineers, \$7,126,000.

Estimated initial expenditure of the power company—

I do not know that the Senator desires that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not know whether or not that means that the additional \$7,000,000 was to be spent to build the power plant, and that only \$8,000,000 was necessary to construct the dams, and so forth.

Mr. KENYON. I understand it that way—that the \$8,000,000 was for the dam for navigation, and the additional amount, necessary for power. That is, the Board of Army Engineers determined what amount they could properly charge to navigation, which, I assume, would be for the building of a dam, without the power purposes.

Mr. LODGE. They exclude the power project, do they not?

Mr. KENYON. This is exclusive of equipment and power-house superstructures.

Mr. LODGE. Yes. This \$7,000,000 is to be used in the development of power, is it not?

Mr. KENYON. It is.

Mr. LODGE. And not needed for navigation?

Mr. KENYON. Not needed for navigation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I suppose, then, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. KENYON. I yield, for a question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then I will ask the Senator whether it means that the \$8,000,000 would be necessary to build a dam for navigation purposes, and \$7,000,000 more would be necessary if it were fully developed with power?

Mr. KENYON. Exactly, as I understand it, for power purposes; so they divided the total amount between the two, and the \$8,000,000, I assume, might be the proper charge to the Government for purely navigation purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But it was all in the line of construction of dams for creating power, and not machinery for the power plant?

Mr. KENYON. That is true.

In the hearings before the House Committee on Military Affairs—I want to follow up this line of evidence—Mr. Washburn

was there. He was asked as to this matter, and as to his plan. He said:

From the nature of the industry there are very few power sites available to it in the United States.

And he took the instance of Muscle Shoals and developed that, showing it as the cooperative plan. This is found on page 158 of the hearings before the Military Affairs Committee of the House. I will not take the time to read that. Mr. McKENZIE of Illinois asked him this question, which makes it fairly plain:

Let me see if I understand just what you mean. If I understand you, your plan of cooperative work is to take a power site where the Government has constructed a dam for purposes of navigation, or to aid navigation, and the company that would manufacture this product would then erect its structure alongside of this power site, and the Government would permit them to use the power, and they would pay, as I understand you, 3 per cent on the cost of the construction of the dam. In other words, the Government would build the dam and the company would erect a structure for the manufacture of the product, cooperating with the manufacturing concern, and the company would manufacture this product to be used for fertilizer during time of peace, and the Government would have the right to take the entire product during time of war, and that the company should pay annually to the Government 3 per cent on the investment in the dam. Is that correct?

Mr. WASHBURN. Upon the investment of the dam and such hydro-electric equipment as was necessary to put the power upon the switchboard. The Government investment, devoted to power purposes, normally would include the dam; and the power house and its equipment and the power would be paid for by the nitrogen industry at 3 per cent of the cost. That would be an annual tax upon the nitrogen industry.

Mr. McKenzie also asked him:

After a careful investigation of this whole subject, it is your judgment that this industry can not be successfully developed without some Government assistance in this country?

Mr. WASHBURN. I am very definitely of the opinion that private capital can not take the risk of the necessarily great investment compared with the return on the costs we would have in the United States, and therefore the industry will not be developed in the United States, but in time will be developed elsewhere, and the product will be imported into the United States.

Again, speaking of his plan:

The \$24,000,000 the Government would expend under that plan would be used exclusively for the production of the single product, nitric acid. The \$48,000,000 would be used not only upon some devices which answer the requirements for making nitric acid but would also be used for the payment of the cost of appliances for manufacturing fertilizer.

With regards to Muscle Shoals there is a good deal said, but I will not take the time to read it.

Before the Committee on Agriculture of the House Mr. Washburn spoke of this same general plan, but it should be stated in fairness to him that he said he had no proposition of any kind to make to the Government. He was asked about the patents covering it. The chairman asked him concerning the patents. He said:

They are controlled by one concern under patents.

The CHAIRMAN. Under patents?

Mr. WASHBURN. United States patents and Canadian patents.

The CHAIRMAN. So that any immediate development of the nitrogen industry in this country would be through the Government subsidy to a monopoly controlling the process?

Mr. WASHBURN. I should not call it a subsidy.

He is asked as to who controls this cyanamid process in this country:

Your company?

Yes.

And he is asked these questions at page 925 of the record of the House Committee on Agriculture:

Mr. RUBEY. What is the date of your patent?

Mr. WASHBURN. You mean of the patent?

Mr. RUBEY. Yes.

Mr. WASHBURN. We have not any single patents. We have about a hundred patents.

Mr. RUBEY. And then the next year and the next year you would have additional patents so that the time never would come—

Mr. WASHBURN. We do not propose that it ever shall come when anybody can compete with us if it is within our power.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. KENYON. I do, for a question.

Mr. BORAH. How does he anticipate that he will prevent that competition, if he discloses that?

Mr. KENYON. I will say that it is all controlled by patents, of which I think it is fair to say that Mr. Washburn and his associates control practically all. I have seen a list of patents from the Patent Office. I know he controls some of them, and he was asked here:

Who controls this process in this country, your company?

Yes.

That is, the Cyanamid Co.

Mr. BORAH. I had supposed it was likely by reason of the patents; but that is a monopoly which has been granted to him by the Government already.

Mr. KENYON. It has been granted to him by the Government, and as I understand the Government is powerless to use any of these processes without violation of the patents, just the same as any private individual—or, rather, they might be able to use them and then the patentees would have their recourse in the Court of Claims.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. KENYON. I do, for a question.
Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I wish to ask the Senator from Iowa if he considers that that is final? I have before me a statement on the exact process about which the question was asked a moment ago, to the effect that the fundamental patents have expired. Various minor modifications and improvements have been patented from time to time during the past 15 years. They are mostly under the control of the Cyanamid Co. They are not absolutely essential, however, to the economical production of powder by this process.

I have received that statement this morning. I wanted to have a thorough investigation, and I received it this morning from Dr. Norton.

Mr. KENYON. As I understand, when the time comes near for the patent to expire, improvements are patented, and the time is extended. That is evidently what the colloquy meant before the Agricultural Committee of the House, when Mr. Washburn said that they did not propose that the time ever should come when anybody would compete with them if it was within their power.

It has been charged that these same parties, for whose company the Board of Engineers have been willing in the past to have the Government loan or invest some \$18,000,000, not only owned the patents on this process, but also controlled the water-power sites around the Muscle Shoals proposition. That question was asked of Mr. Washburn in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate. This Muscle Shoals project bobs up before so many committees that it is difficult to keep track of it.

Senator KENYON. Have other people associated with your company been working on the Shields bill, or on this proposition?

Mr. WASHBURN. Yes; in connection with the Shields bill.

Senator KENYON. And on this proposition, too?

Mr. WASHBURN. Yes.

Senator KENYON. Mr. Worthington?

Mr. WASHBURN. Mr. Worthington has worked in connection with the proposed development at Muscle Shoals primarily, as it originally was in the interest of the Muscle Shoals Hydro-Electric Power Co., which owns certain rights, etc., at Muscle Shoals.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator the date of that hearing.

Mr. KENYON. This hearing was March 16 and 17, 1916.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Very close at hand?

Mr. KENYON. Very close at hand.

Mr. Washburn's plan, which is very similar to the plan set forth in Document 20, has been elucidated by him before the Military Committee of the House, before the Committee on Agriculture of the House, before the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate, and the plan is substantially the same plan, with some variations, as the one the Army engineers reported in favor of. That is why I have said that, in my judgment, the evidence is sufficient to show sufficient basis for the statement made that under the Underwood amendment we might just as well write the location Muscle Shoals.

I should like to see an amendment that would be a sort of halfway between these matters that would provide for a complete investigation of all processes by some competent body not already committed and an investigation of proper sites. I do not want to legislate on something that is simply going to be an assistance to private corporations in this country and no benefit to the rest of the people. I have not meant to say that Muscle Shoals was not a great proposition and possibly the proper place for it. I do not know. This great water power placed there by the Almighty should be used by the Government for the benefit of all and no monopoly permitted to control it.

I want to read from the hearings one or two things. On page 908, House Agriculture Committee, Mr. Washburn stated that the great development had come through using steam power. That is in the German nitrogen plants. On page 910 he spoke of the power site on the Columbia River. I think I should say that his claim was that there are only two proper power sites in this country for this development, one on the Columbia River at Priest Rapids and the other at Muscle Shoals. Dr. Baekeland, before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, said that those power sites in the far West were no better than if the plant were in Iceland, because of the railroad rates in transporting the product.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. JONES. In other words, the qualification in these two amendments with reference to fertilizers would cut out of consideration those plants in the West?

Mr. KENYON. I think so. I think it cuts them out. It does not cut out Niagara Falls, of course. The astounding statement was made there that the water power at Niagara Falls would be sufficient, if used for fertilizers, to increase the wheat crop of this country 3,000,000 bushels per day.

Mr. JONES. What I meant was that the qualification requiring the plant to be developed with a view to getting fertilizer would necessarily exclude the consideration of a plant in a far-western State.

Mr. KENYON. To be perfectly frank with the Senator, I think it does do that practically because of the cost of transportation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I did not hear the question of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. KENYON. He inquired if the fertilizer part of this amendment did not result in practically cutting out the power sites of the West because of the cost of transportation. As I stated, Dr. Baekeland, who seems to be a very eminent authority, said we might as well have the plant in Iceland, that the rates would be less to that country than to that part of this country needing the fertilizers if the plant were in any of the extreme Western States.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That would not—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That would not be true if the stream were navigable and reasonably near the Pacific, would it?

Mr. KENYON. I assume not, if they could get a rate down through the Panama Canal, but I have not studied that proposition.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. KENYON. I do for a question.

Mr. THOMAS. If the railway rates are so excessive as to prohibit an otherwise desirable site for a power plant in the development of this proposed method of producing nitrogen, does it not suggest either a further extension of Governmental control of the railway systems or the possession of them, as Germany has taken possession of them, as a part of the general scheme of preparedness? In other words, if we are going to prepare national defenses upon an adequate scale, does not that situation suggest the prime necessity, among other things, of controlling the lines of transportation of the country?

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator believe we are going into a military camp in this country?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not, but many want us to do it; and yet those who are anxious for an extreme plan of preparedness have not thus far suggested what seems to me to be a prime element in such a plan, an element which Germany recognized 40 years ago, and that is the acquisition or the control by the Government of the various lines of transportation in the country.

Mr. KENYON. I will not go into a discussion of that. It is too broad a field, and I have talked about long enough. I do not want to delay this bill.

From the Manufacturers' Record of March 9, 1916, I place in the Record as evidence on the proposition I am discussing the statement of the Alabama Power Co., in a part of which they say:

In connection with the occasion for employing the \$96,000,000, not covered by immediate plans, it is stated that "the Alabama Co.'s ultimate development in Alabama is predicated upon legislation regarding power sites now sought in Washington and bears special reference to the use of Muscle Shoals. The large water-power site owners of the country are pressing certain legislation which is being as stoutly resisted by others who claim that too much encroachment upon the rights of the public is contemplated in the form in which the power-site owners desire this legislation. The use of the remainder of the \$100,000,000 available bears relation to the ultimate future and the possibilities of favorable legislation."

Certainly the impression has been conveyed to the good people who live in the region of Muscle Shoals that the Government is going to engage in a wonderful development there. I do not take a great deal of stock in lobby investigations. Of course, if the powder trust is doing what the Senator from Alabama said, it probably should be investigated. If others are doing what has been charged on the House side, they probably ought to be investigated also. I do not think as a general thing Members of Congress are particularly influenced by anybody coming to see

them. For my part, I am always glad to see anyone who has any information, and think I have been able to stand up against any influences thus far. But if there was to be any investigation of the powder company I want to see it go far enough to investigate the activities of the water-power companies also.

I received an invitation to visit Muscle Shoals last May, my expenses to be paid from the point of departure, and the exact time of departure being given, but as I have been opposed to the proposition in the past and expected to be opposed to it in the future I did not accept the very kindly hospitality. However, there were evidently some acceptances, and I hold in my hand a paper which leads me to believe that the good people down in Alabama at least believe that this is a project for Muscle Shoals. This paper is the Huntsville Daily Times of May 12, 1915. It is headed "Dam Muscle Shoals." There is no typographical error in that, I think.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what the Senator has been doing very effectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair will admonish Senators that the rules provide that before interrupting a Senator the Chair shall be addressed and permission granted by the Senator occupying the floor.

Mr. KENYON. This write up of the meeting down there and various Members of Congress who attended it is very interesting. I am not going to read it all. I merely cite it as a part of the line of evidence I have been trying to introduce in support of my statement that we might as well write Muscle Shoals into the Underwood amendment and be done with it. Certainly that is the impression in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals. This paper, the Huntsville Daily Times, says:

Between 5,000 and 6,000 people shout the merits of Muscle Shoals, and with one voice say, "Dam it, we need it." Occasion a gala one and success comes in near future.

United pull to extract the cork from the Tennessee and make the river a blessing to mankind. Big system of cooperation between private capital and the Government. Joint congressional inspection of proposed waterway a pleasing and stupendous success.

It was indeed—

The paper says—

the greatest event of its kind ever celebrated in the United States, and if any of the congressional party had any doubts as to the desire of this people and their complete interest in the development of this matchless enterprise it was forever removed when they visited Muscle Shoals and saw with their own eyes the water power that will bring a new world to this country.

It was a memorable occasion, the demonstration being marked by a wonderful outpouring of people of the immediate counties surrounding the proposed and completed navigation development at Muscle Shoals, and from the nine vitally interested near-by States.

A huge impression was made on the visitors and the only regret is that the whole of Congress could not be there on this or any other occasion and see the real good. It is actual, a substantial business proposition, not the hope of a dreamer. Impressions satisfactory were made on the visitors, and when they face their colleagues in December there should be a prompt adoption of the United States Army engineers' recommendation and let the final work proceed. Confidence believes this will be done promptly.

That Niagara is a baby compared with the tremendous value and importance of Muscle Shoals possibilities goes without saying.

So it proceeds. I will not read the speeches of the various Members of the House and Members of the Senate upon that very enthusiastic occasion, but I want to refer to the conclusion of the article:

The Tennessee River Improvement Association declares that the Muscle Shoals project is a challenge to the courage and genius of the President, the Secretary of War, and the Congress of the United States for immediate adoption.

Mr. President, that may be so.

If our visitors would know the inspiration for the hope and confident belief of the Tennessee River Improvement Association, that the first session of the Sixty-fourth Congress will adopt the Muscle Shoals project as recommended by the United States engineers, they will find our hopes and our sentiments expressed in the last annual message of President Wilson to Congress as follows:

The poor President is drawn in to sustain the Muscle Shoals proposition, although I can not find that he says a single word about it; but such things read well in a newspaper.

The Chief of Engineers of the United States Army—

This paper says—

the greatest and most competent in the world have said the project is practical, feasible, and good. They are the captains, the final judges to make the decision. This has been done and this people call upon Congress to say amen to it.

That has been some of the business of Congress for some time, not entirely, I understand, confined to this branch.

The Muscle Shoals project having been recommended for congressional adoption by the United States Engineers, it was very appropriate of course for the keynote of the occasion to be Dam Muscle Shoals and dam it now.

Now, Mr. President, I have not intended in my brief and rather scattering remarks to say anything to reflect upon anyone. I have placed some matters before the Senate that seemed a duty. These gentlemen have the right to believe, as they do believe with basis for it, that Muscle Shoals is a great project. If some board to be appointed should, after considering all the facts, be in favor of Muscle Shoals for our Government plant, I should not raise my voice against it, but I am objecting to adopting an amendment to this bill which gives to the Army Engineers the power to select a site when the record, statements, and documents show that the Army Engineers some years ago had practically adopted this as the best site for a great water power. If the Board of Army Engineers have determined that question what is the use in having them do it again? If the Government is to build and maintain these plants they should be located in different parts of the country where in time of peace they may be of the most good to the greatest number of our people.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I regret that there are expressions in the able speech of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] who has just taken his seat and whom I admire very much, that I think are calculated to draw attention from the real merits of the question and to arouse prejudice against a great water power and men who may develop it. I never heard of Mr. Washburn until the day he appeared before the Committee on Agriculture about three weeks ago. I knew there was a cyanamide process and that fertilizers were being manufactured in Canada by somebody and shipped into the United States. I had heard that that plant would have been located on the Muscle Shoals, Tennessee River, but for the fact that a bill allowing the development of that water power passed by Congress some time ago was vetoed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Coosa River.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Coosa River. I thought it was the Muscle Shoals. It was somewhere, in northern Alabama.

Mr. President, the importance of producing nitrates inside of the United States and from the air can not be overestimated. Unquestionably if our Nation were involved in war with any nation possessing a substantial fleet the supply of nitrate of sodium or saltpeter from Chile would be cut off to a dangerous extent.

It was shown before the Committee on Agriculture that while Germany had laid in a large supply of the raw material out of which nitric acid was to be manufactured for military supplies, it was exhausted in three months after the war began, and but for the capacity of Germany to produce nitric acid from the air they would have been almost helpless.

It is essential to the production of food also in our country. It increases largely our food supply. In case of war it is essential.

It seems that there are two processes for extracting nitrogen from the air, one of which is called the arc process and the other the cyanamide process. So far only those two processes have been perfected. The arc process requires a much greater water power, the principal plants using this process being located in Norway. Germany adopted the cyanamide process for lack of greater water power. A plant can not be economically operated without 100,000 horsepower all the time.

Mr. President, if we have a water power of that kind it ought to be used, and it is the part of wisdom to take the necessary steps to have it prepared for use at once.

Reference has been made to Niagara Falls. It was fully brought to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture that we are limited in the use of Niagara Falls by treaty, and we are now using practically all the water power we could from Niagara Falls. The commercial requirements of New York State are at present consuming practically the entire water-power product that can be had from those Falls. Then, again, it is not a proper location for a plant upon which the United States should depend for military purposes. Any wise selection would involve going reasonably far from the border.

Mr. President, I am not wedded to the idea of the construction of this plant by the Government, but I do believe that the Government ought not to stand in the way of developing such a plant; on the contrary, it ought to take action which will insure it.

No private company could build a plant upon a navigable stream without Government concession. No private company could build a plant in the West upon Government land. Private companies will to-day find their hands tied in any effort to develop such an enterprise, unless the opportunity for use of a navigable stream or a stream located on Government lands is provided by congressional action.

I am sorry the Tennessee River does not flow through Georgia. I really think that the best of everything should go to my own State, and I wish this plant was to be built in Georgia. But,

unfortunately, the Tennessee River is not there. I do not care, it being outside of Georgia, whether it is in Ohio or Indiana or western Pennsylvania or West Virginia or Kentucky. It happens to be located nearly on the edge of southern Tennessee and northern Alabama.

The Senator from Iowa seems to be disturbed about the fact that the result of this bill would cause the development of Muscle Shoals, on the Tennessee River. In my own opinion, if anything intelligent on this line is done, if the wisest course is pursued, it will be built there. And why not, if it is to be east of the Mississippi River? The great bulk of our population is east of the Mississippi River, and without saying that there should not also be one built in the West, there certainly ought to be one in the East, and that Muscle Shoals is the place in the East I have no question. Engineers, or anyone else who studies the problem, guided simply by search of the truth, will in all probability determine that the one great interior point for water-power development east of the Mississippi River is on the Tennessee River, which happens to be located in northern Alabama. Why? Because this river at that point is a mile wide and the banks over 100 feet high, stretching back for miles and miles. A dam can be built across the stream a mile in length, 100 feet high, furnishing over 100,000 horsepower at lowest water.

If there is some other place east of the Mississippi River that is better, take it. I have not only no interest in Muscle Shoals, but I never heard of Mr. Washburn until he appeared before the Committee on Agriculture. Do not get the idea that Mr. Washburn has a company that will control if Muscle Shoals is developed. He has not. I believe that two dams should be built in the Tennessee River, if possible, to develop navigation, and that their construction would be a great contribution to navigation. If they can be built, making their construction for navigation and also to produce a water power that will more than pay interest on the cost of their construction, then we get the navigation free. If the Government builds the dam and develops the power and contributes to the navigation of the stream, then I think it would be stupid on the part of the Government if it did not dispose of the power, if it can be done, in such a way as to carry the cost of construction. If Washburn had a company that would take the power on proper terms from the Government and carry the cost of the development, I would not object to his having it. If the Du Pont Powder Co. are ready to take it and pay the cost of this great development under contracts that will guarantee that the Government will pay for the product from the manufactory which it needs at proper prices, at prices to be approved by the Secretary of War, I will not object to their having it.

This I say, although I believe, when practicable, the Government should manufacture those things it needs for purposes of war.

There is one feature of this amendment that I do not like. It excludes the Government from having anything to do with any private company. If we produce power for the construction of a dam and can dispose of the power to any company advantageously and take the burdens of the development entirely off the taxpayers of the country there is nothing in such a proposition that at all frightens me.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes, sir.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Would the Senator be opposed to the Government manufacturing these fertilizers?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I did not say I was.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I can not see the difference between the Government creating the power and selling it and creating the nitrate and selling that, and if the Government should do that, it could be—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yielded to the Senator for a question only, which is all I can yield for under the rule.

Mr. President, I am in favor of the Government going no further into the business as a competitor of private enterprise than is essential to furnish to the public that which the public is entitled to have. The water power of the stream belongs to the Government. It can not be developed except by authority of the Government.

I should be willing, under proper arrangement, to permit the dam and locks to be built by private enterprise, if the arrangement could be made in a perfectly satisfactory manner. I regard it as a business problem.

What I rose for, Mr. President, was to say that I think it unfortunate to inject anything into this debate that would create prejudice against a private corporation building a nitrate plant or a fertilizer plant—against the Government permitting it to use a water power for such a purpose. I think it unfortunate

in any way to create a prejudice against what seems to be the greatest water-power opportunity for development that we have east of the Mississippi River. Unless somebody can point me to a better water power, it would not frighten me at all to put Muscle Shoals into the amendment. If that is the best water-power site, there it ought to be.

Mr. President, without being wedded to any particular plant, and without being hostile to any plan, I do insist that it is our duty either to take steps in behalf of the Government to develop the necessary water power without delay or to take steps on the part of the Government to permit some private corporation to develop the water power without delay. The chief cause of delay in time of war, if we needed nitric acid, would be the construction of the dams and the creation of the water power. It would take much less time to complete the industrial end of the enterprise in the shape of assembling the necessary machinery.

I hope the Senate will consider the subject without prejudice on account of the fact that a number of Senators once went down to see Muscle Shoals. I was not in the party; I did not know until the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] told us about it that there had been a party of Senators and Members of the other House who went down to see Muscle Shoals; but if what I am informed is true, they saw a wonderful opportunity for water-power development. I have no preference as to locality, provided the best suited to the purpose is selected; but, so far as my information goes, if we are to have a plant east of the Mississippi River, and are to take the best place, we shall put the plant east of the Mississippi River, on the Tennessee River, at Muscle Shoals.

Mr. LEWIS and Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield the floor?

Mr. LEWIS. I wish first to ascertain what is the request of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. At this particular juncture, so as to sustain the continuity of what has been said, I want merely to read—and it would not take more than five minutes, if so long as that—into the RECORD an explanation of certain facts, which I think are pertinent. I prefer to do that now rather than to have the continuity of what has been said broken. Of course I could do so at some other time, but this being the proper time if, without prejudice to the rights of the Senator from Illinois, he can yield to me for a sufficient length of time and then be recognized, I wish he would do so. Of course I should very much dislike to have him lose his place because of doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield the floor?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I have yielded the floor once or twice previously to accommodate a Senator. I do not like to interrupt my speech; but while my remarks, such as I expect to submit, are not wholly upon this subject, I will yield a few minutes, if the Senator from South Carolina so desires, and trust that I may be recognized immediately following him.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will remind Senators that this is a recess, and that the rule of the Senate that Senators may not speak more than twice in one day on the same subject would apply. The present occupant of the chair, however, has no disposition to insist upon the observance of the rule, unless occasion makes it necessary for him to do so. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, do I understand that the rule in regard to speaking twice on the same subject would apply to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It certainly would, if insisted on.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. What I mean to say is that I have not spoken on this subject this morning at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; but this is the same legislative day as yesterday; it is one legislative day.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understand the Chair to hold—and I do not dissent from the view of the Chair at all—that this day starts with the first legislative day; that it is a continuation of that day, and that the rule limits a Senator to two speeches on one subject throughout the entire legislative day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the present legislative day started on the 30th day of March.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The President pro tempore of the Senate, who made the ruling, stated that, in his judgment, the appeal which was made to the Senate, and on which the ruling of the Chair was not sustained, did away with the rule to which the Chair now refers, and that the rule hereafter would be that interruptions would be permitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair will take occasion to say to the Senator from Colorado that that was an entirely different question from the one now involved. There being no objection, the Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, several of the speakers this morning took occasion to say that the processes for the production of nitrogen were in an imperfect and nebulous condition; that nothing in relation thereto was settled. There are two gentlemen upon whom we should rely by virtue of the position which they occupy in relation to this question; one is Dr. Norton, who is employed by this Government, who was sent to Germany, and who returned just previous to the outbreak of the war; the other is the chemist of the consulting board of the Navy. I am going to put into the RECORD what these gentlemen say about these processes. I will also include what Mr. Washburn said with reference to whether or not this process is practicable. Mr. Washburn said:

So the point I wish to make is this, that the nitrogen industry is no longer in the experimental stage.

It has taken the greatest scientists in the world, men understanding such things, 16 years to bring it to where it is a great, successful, reliable, extraordinarily cheap method of producing the most valuable single substance known to mankind.

Dr. Baekeland says:

The whole situation is a shame to the human race. We know how to get nitrogen from the air; we know how to increase the yields of our acres. We do not do it, although those chemical processes are no longer secrets, and we know all about them. The key to the whole situation is better utilization of our natural resources of cheap power. If you make your nitrogen compounds or your nitric acid at too high prices, you may be able to use it in war time—in war time nothing is too expensive when it comes to murdering each other.

Dr. Baekeland, the consulting chemist for the Naval Board, makes that statement. He further says:

This nitric acid is made by a chemical process, which, I am glad to say, the chemists of the United States can duplicate at any time. There is no particular secret about it, and if the chemists of the United States were confronted with this problem I have no hesitation in saying that, if properly supported and given the necessary time, they would make as good a showing for themselves as did the German chemists.

The question of the fixation of nitrogen from the air from the chemical standpoint is clear and easy, and is a problem no more difficult than any other chemical problem.

Dr. Norton, on the same subject, states:

The nitrogen derived from the air in that way easily meets in competition Chilean saltpeter. It holds its own; the works are being enlarged. That demonstrates to us, with perfect clearness, that we can take the nitrogen out of the air; we can put it into such a form that it is susceptible of utilization for our agriculture, and on even terms with the supplies from Chile.

Furthermore, gentlemen, you must remember that the supplies of Chilean saltpeter are limited.

So I want to set at rest right at this juncture the idea that we are feeling our way and were about to make an appropriation for something as to the practicability of which nobody had decided. Germany is an evidence that it can be accomplished; the process at Niagara is testimony as to that, and if the word of scientists can be taken at all, we need not hesitate.

I wanted to present this evidence just at this juncture, because I did not desire Senators, who will consider this question seriously, to be misled as to their being any doubt in the minds of anybody who really wants this ingredient that we are prepared to obtain it.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I arise to submit some remarks suggested by the early part of the speech of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], and the expressions of other Senators along similar lines. The Senator from Iowa expressed some doubt as to the wisdom of introducing this measure touch-

ing nitrates at this particular time. He questioned the wisdom of having it annexed in any form upon a general bill of legislation designated for the increase of the Army, and asks that it later be treated as separate legislation.

My reflections, Mr. President, bring me to a viewpoint, which I here express, doubtless meeting the unfavorable observations of some of my fellow Senators. I do not feel that we in the Senate are properly appreciating the aspect in which we are being held by the country, whose servants we are. These measures which are now being suggested, which necessarily occupy time for debate upon their merits, and which to the country at large seem foreign to the real bill at issue, are impressing the country with one thought: either that as to this war measure we have not statesmanship enough to sustain it and to pass it quickly, with the spirit that should attend it, or, if opposed to it, we lack courage to say so. That there is a disposition manifested by our conduct to avoid responsibility at both sides of the issue.

Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa alluded to a letter from one of his constituents demanding that the public buildings hereafter authorized by Congress be constructed in a shape that is round, the constituent intimating his opposition to any public building that should be constructed square. The general opinion of the country is that there is no public building emanating from Congress that is "square." [Laughter.] The Senator from Iowa by his letter recalls the general attitude of mind that Iowa has to this body. I recall that a distinguished Member from Iowa, now departed, Maj. Lacey, formerly chairman of the Committee on Public Lands—I had the pleasure and the honor to serve on his committee and under him—received a letter from one of his constituents which read something as follows:

DEAR MR. LACY: I have been gettin' them books called obituaries and have been readin' them speeches about them dead Congressmen. I wish you would please have more of them obituaries sent out to our people in Iowa, for nothin' we please so much as to read about dead Congressmen.

[Laughter.]

The public mind is likely to apply that expression in a political way; and unless we move about something in a spirit that shows our desire for action, either for or against, we will meet a sentiment on the part of our countrymen that politically will visit deace, if not upon the Senator politically, upon the respect in which the office is held.

These amendments on collateral subjects presented by Senators from different States have no doubt great merit; and the fact that a prolonged debate is indulged upon them indicates that they have a merit that can be advanced for them and that there are objections which have merit that may be presented against them; but it all demonstrates that we are having now presented collateral subjects which are taking the time of the Senate at a time when, I respectfully insist, we should move absolutely to the end that we are about to accomplish. We should either surround our Government at this time with force sufficient to meet its exigencies as we see them, or announcing to the country that we do not agree that such exigencies exist, cease parleying with this question of preparation, and turn our attention wholly to these other subjects which refer to the civil welfare of the citizen.

SITUATION OF COUNTRY.

Mr. President, I view the situation of my country at this particular time as rather precarious in the matter of her diplomatic surroundings. I behold the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. STONE] sitting here, doing me the honor to pay heed to these observations. Missouri can well lay "unction to her soul" at the compliment afforded the State in having her distinguished citizen preside over that equally distinguished committee. The attention he has been giving to these public questions, the patience which has characterized his investigations, and the ability disclosed in his discussions are guaranties that these great considerations will be attended to with patience, discretion, and statesmanship. Mr. President, I fear for the impression we are leaving upon the country at large. It is either that we do not regard the conditions of our country calling for the immediateness of action on our part and have not the courage to say so, or that we do so regard them, but have not the statesmanship to act with the immediateness that the situation calls for. We must gather much of our information from the public press. We take some of it from that which is confided to us in our official capacity; but it is no exaggeration to say that we all recognize that this is the hour when there is necessity for action.

Mr. President, there is Mexico. Deplorable as is the situation in Mexico, the incontrovertible fact is there is Mexico with the deplorable situation. Some sources have been affording the enemy

of the United States in Mexico munitions of warfare. Whether smuggled in by those who are guilty of the meretricious trade without regard to nationality, or whether tendered these forces by those in the United States inimical to the welfare of the United States, is unsettled and may be debated; but the fact remains that there is some form of aid being given Villa and his followers by those whose particular identity we may not at this time assign, but aid of quality sufficient to make the task of the United States more difficult than it at first appeared, and will continue to make it more difficult as time goes on and the opportunities for those who act against us be increased.

MEXICO.

Mr. President, there has come the information through the public press—and from the foreign press particularly—that the United States is upon the eve of withdrawing from Mexico because of these new and multiplied embarrassments. It might as well now be understood, speaking wholly for myself and only for myself, that, so far as I am concerned, the United States will not withdraw from the undertaking it has so commendably entered upon in this punitive expedition to properly chastise those who have violated the honor of the country, and to punish those who have taken the lives of citizens of the United States. We have undertaken this task because of the justice in it, because of the right of the United States, and because of the necessity for it. We are going to maintain the dignity of our country and the freedom of an American. Therefore, in the language of the Scriptures, "Having laid our hand to the plow, we will not look back"; or, if I may apply an expression in the Merchant of Venice—

An oath, an oath, I have an oath in heaven:
Shall I lay perjury upon my soul?
No; not for Venice.

Therefore, Mr. President, it becomes important, as I view it, that speedy action on the part of this body touching these measures of preparation be had. That speedy action be had in order that those who assume that this body is indifferent to supporting the President in these undertakings may obtain—from the evidence we give proof to the contrary—that all may see that what we are doing has for its object the putting behind the President at a very early moment—and at the most early moment feasible—all the power that the wisdom and statesmanship of this body can justify. That rather than that we should, through measures that are only incidental, delay the matter, that we give the other evidence—that we move to it with that rapidity which recognizes that in rapid action in supporting the President and the measures of preparation we justify before the country the movement undertaken, and by it announce to all those who may be concerned in the question as to whether we will withdraw or lessen our zeal, that, to the contrary, far from lessening it by virtue of the increased difficulties, we increase our perseverance and multiply our own activities. That we will meet these difficulties as fast as they shall arise, conscious, as we are, of our strength and of the rectitude of our conduct, and we assert that we are absolutely convinced that shortly that which we seek to do—execute justice—will be done by the United States in Mexico.

Now, Mr. President, not only will our delay add to these embarrassments to which I am alluding, but our course will be misconstrued abroad. It will be charged that we are hesitating to support these measures of necessary defense for the lack of support of our countrymen on the outside of this Chamber. It will be said that we do not feel that our countrymen at large are behind their public representatives, and for that reason we are dismayed. That we are discouraged, or that we hesitate for fear of the political punishment that may be visited upon us by a constituency that may be opposed to the constructive policy here undertaken.

Mr. President, one of the very last places to obtain the political sentiment of America is here at the Capital, at Washington. The most deplorable fact that has been established before this country seems to be this, that whenever a Senator has become unpopular in this body, he has by the things that makes him disliked here become the most liked and the most popular among the people; and the Senator who oftentimes receives at the hands of a certain form of constituency in this country approval and praise has the least standing in this body, as a man either of constructive measures or of patriotism. This I merely mention to indicate how poor a judge is this forum and how much poorer a judge is this locality in Washington of the public sentiment that surrounds our country.

Mr. President, I am not one who would yield to public sentiment merely because it is such, unless I could feel that that sentiment is one that spoke the needs of my country. I prefer, sir, to dispute with the king whose theory was that we should not rule according to the weal of the people but to the will

of the king. I would rather take the other rule, that so soon as we could justly ascertain what is the weal of our countrymen, we turn to serve these needs, and not be moved from them, because here and there there may be evidences on the part of those who have not had opportunity to reflect of opposition suddenly exploding against the policies which, thought, calmness, and consideration on the part of the public agents of the country have undertaken.

It is believed by many that the vote in the State of Michigan, whereby one of the distinguished Members of this body and one of the eminent presidential candidates from the vast numbers which the Senate produces, received something of a hip-and-thigh blow from his brother—was an indication that the country at large had reversed its sentiments touching the need of a national defensive policy as against dangers that all men who look with clear vision must behold.

Mr. President, that there will arise from time to time expressions such as we have seen in Michigan we all will admit; but, sir, we can not assume from these that our countrymen have reversed their orders—that its Representatives shall do that which they know is necessary for the welfare of the country at large. We should not only not be moved by these whiffs, but we will earn the contempt of our countrymen if we let them behold that, with every wind that blows slightly against our cheek, we turn from our task and fly from that direction where we think ultimately the storm may come.

Mr. President, not only, therefore, do the conditions in Mexico call for our supporting whatever may be the policy of the President, and supporting it with such movement here as will indicate to the country at large the immediateness of action on the part of this body—putting arms, force, discipline, and patriotism behind him—but they also call for action in order that the outside world shall not assume that we have lagged in our sense of appreciation of these situations, and that the opponents of the policy of the United States may not draw further license from this delay to assume that we are unprepared to back up quickly and sufficiently the movement we have undertaken in Mexico.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to ask the Senator if the President has not announced, through the War Department, that he had all the power he wanted in Mexico?

Mr. LEWIS. Has the Senator concluded?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Yes. I understood that the War Department has stated that they needed no further troops for Mexico. They might need a good pack of dogs; but I do not see any need of more troops.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, it may be the Senator is right that the President has made a statement that no more troops now are needed in Mexico. I do not know concerning that. I am not referring to an immediate use of troops; I am referring to some action of Congress in preparing the country in whatever way it shall decide to prepare, so that, whatever may be needed now or hereafter may be at hand. This is wiser than to allow this delay that I see will be considered as an evidence on the part of this honorable body that it does not appreciate the gravity of a situation which at any time may make necessary further aid to the President.

GERMANY AND THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. President, I come to a second feature, to which I feel I can well invite the attention of the body as a justification for our not further intruding immaterial and collateral matters upon the pending bill.

The diplomatic relations between this country and Germany, gathered from the public press and from other information, indicate very clearly that the United States is nearer to the necessity of having to choose some decisive course than it ever has been since the beginning of the dispute over the *Lusitania* or since the arising of complications over the submarine warfare. It is sufficient to say that both sides of this Chamber will be found supporting the administration in whatever course it shall take as the final act of America; but it is perfectly clear, Mr. President, that the United States has now reached the point when it must apply to itself the Scriptural injunction:

Choose you this day whom ye will serve.

If the policy of the United States is to be that which the distinguished President has uttered in public places—that the United States asks for itself only that which it asks for humanity—then, sir, we must be prepared to obtain for all humanity that which we are assuming to ask for ourselves. It must be very plain, Mr. President, that if such shall be the course we

are to embark upon, then, for the protection of humanity at large, the whole theory of the Republic must be changed, if not wholly transformed, and a course of offensive attitude on the part of America must be entered upon that shall be sufficient in its strength to obtain for humanity that which we will demand in behalf of America.

We can not utter the doctrine as a text on the one hand and ignore it in execution on the other. This would make us ridiculous in the eyes of the wise and make us contemptible before the face of the brave.

Therefore, sir, if such is to be the policy, all the more is it necessary now that we should proceed with such measures of power as will enact them into legislation. This is essential, that the country may know how far we have gone; that from that knowledge they may derive the fact of how far afterwards we are able to go. Without the President of the United States having the information from Congress as to what support is to be put behind him, he is left uncertain as to what course to take. Not only is he left uncertain, but he is forced necessarily to present himself before the country as changing his viewpoint from time to time to meet the exigencies put upon him by Congress. Then he is to be charged, as he has been, with the "change of opinion," apparently without justification, when his real justification is that he is forced to change his attitude by the attitude of his superiors—the people, speaking through their official representatives.

Conditions change, Mr. President. It was Emerson, I believe, who remarked that consistency was the virtue of fools, while an eminent Greek left behind him the statement for us that they who could not change their minds could not hope to know when their life had changed. Things may occur to-day and, by existing, may call for one set of observations on the part of a wise ruler or a wise governor who is prudent and cautious and anxious to avoid the assertion of extremes that may invite opposition, create antagonism, and awaken enmity; and yet, sir, after having made every effort to appease an aroused multitude and quell the mutiny in the body politic by assuring them that the hour upon us is one of security, should subsequent events develop, not of his making but at the instance of others, that render insecure that which previously looked firm and secure, he may find his duty—as duty of the President would be—to admonish his countrymen of these changed affairs, and to invite their attention to them. Then, if he felt the policy should change from that which it was in the past to the new present, it is courage on his part to assert such and demand the change. It would have been a lack of statesmanship to adhere to the yesterdays when they have been changed by the to-morrows.

So, Mr. President, if the future policy of this country, with regard to foreign nations is to be different from that of the past, and we are to be forced unhappily to deal with them in the manner that they are dealing with each other, and in the only manner which it appears they accept, by force, it would be foolhardiness for us to blind our eyes to surrounding situations and to refuse to prepare for those conditions by this one form of preparation—legitimate force.

Sir, the real question is, To what extent shall our country go for preparation? There are two extremes of thought. They seem so far apart that the man seeking to be just has difficulty to reconcile them.

WHAT IS THE JUST MIDDLE GROUND?

And, sir, the question remains, What is the just intermediate ground made necessary by the conditions of the country? If, Mr. President, the distinguished head of our Government shall adhere for the future to the lesser policy we have seen announced as his second proposition—the protection of an American citizen in the enjoyment of an American right wherever he is—then, sir, we have the second proposition to prepare for. If we shall not embark upon the first, of giving the guarantee to humanity, wherever they are, of the full extent of protection that we give to our own citizens, we will essentially be driven, soon or late, to that other of assuring to the American, wherever he is, the full enjoyment of an American's rights when asserted in peace and within the law. To do this, Mr. President, even though we should qualify the previous doctrine and not assume the guardianship of humanity at large, we will nevertheless, sir, have to prepare ourselves for such course of action as will present to the world our ability to enforce the just rights of the American, exercising an American's privilege, wherever that American is. This latter expression is the text I offer as our practicable duty.

But, sir, it is foolishness, and the office of a braggart, that we should announce to the world the right of an American within an American's rights, and our announcement of his privilege to enjoy them, and yet present before the world our utter inability to secure him in this enjoyment. That, sir, makes us ridiculous;

such presents us before the world as subject to the criticism of being vain boasters; and while we may tickle the ears of the groundling by boastful halloos, we make the judicious grieve when they behold the true situation in which our country may be—boastful but useless; hopeful but helpless.

Mr. President, I desire to have it understood that I do not agree with the distinguished Senators in the idea expressed that this country is unprepared to back up any demands. Some things have been wholly lost sight of. That in addition to the Army and the National Guard there are a million men in this country who have had some form of service through the Guard, through the Volunteer service, through the national Army, through the last generation, and who have from time to time passed out into other occupations, and who at this time possess the training they have had during these last 20 years. These are accessible for some uses, and in their valor and patriotism can be relied upon to the full extent of their complete capacity.

Nor can I concur in the suggestion, made here and there, that our country is unprepared to defend itself. To the contrary, if left alone as against any single opponent that might arise, our country is as amply prepared to meet any advance against it this day as it ever has been at any time since the Civil War, and it is better prepared now than it ever has been at any time since the Spanish-American War.

Let it be remembered that no mind could have conceived that there would have been a combination of the world in war in this civilized era. We shall hereafter be forced to characterize the present pending war as the "War of the Twentieth Century." The war of the world, combining nations together in a crash and combination of power through events which no philosophy could have reasoned out, no statesmanship anticipated, and to which no form of military preparation could have been adequate.

If there shall arise in this body a Senator, however sincere, who would assume that the United States shall embark upon a course of preparation that shall be equal in power to all forms of contingencies that might arise through the combined assaults of the world, our answer is, our countrymen would not accept the program. You never can make our fellow citizens at large believe that such a holocaust could befall America. First, they behold no affront given on our part against the world, as they see it. They behold no offense on the part of America to mankind at large. They behold no reason why there should be such preparation to meet such imagined combined foe. But, alas! our countrymen do not realize that there is more to be considered than that. This country is not preparing to make assault upon any other country. True, sir, this Nation of ours is not contemplating assailing others. Our countrymen, however, fail to realize that the countries at large throughout the world have arisen with grievances, real or imaginary, against their neighbors in Europe. Their hearts are filled with old and long-contested disputes; their minds inflamed with revenges that have been surging in their lives; and their souls aflame with retaliation and resentments that have been multiplying through a century. Our countrymen fail to recognize that this very spirit when aroused, this very flame when lighted, heeds not the course it will take, and at any hour in its fury will mistake the course of America asserting her just rights as an assault upon another country. This they will charge to be a wrong against them.

POSSIBILITIES OF FUTURE COMPLICATION.

Let us dwell, sir, for a moment on the possibilities of such antagonism by only suggesting a phase or two of our threatening surroundings. We recall that respecting our trade we have demanded of England: First, that she cease opening the private letters of our fellow citizens; second, that she cease obstructing the commerce of our countrymen; third, that she end interfering with neutrals in the direct enjoyment of their legitimate commerce within international law and international practice. Britain feels that in these demands we are doing her injustice, and are putting an impediment in her way to accomplish that which she feels is essential to her future life if she shall exist as a nation upon the face of the earth.

Germany beholds us selling supplies and ammunition to the allies. She reckons this as a direct assault upon her opportunities, and a violation of what she feels should be the humane doctrine of neutrality. Then beholds us ever as an ally of Britain in our war upon her use of submarines in sea warfare. She sits as one brooding in deep grievance, and because of this, together with other offenses which she claims we have visited upon her, joins Austria in the resentment she has against us. We sent Von Papen and the military attachés to their homes, and likewise sent back the Austrian ambassador in dishonor. Austria and Germany feel the sting of this indignity put upon

them. They suffer under the insult that they seem compelled to endure before the world. We justify our actions on the ground of Americanism, and can not retreat.

Mr. President, Russia still feels that the United States committed a grave affront to her when we severed the commercial treaties because of her treatment of certain of our citizens, and because of her inability at that time to come harmoniously to an understanding with us which we hope in the future will be soon entered on. Russia likewise feels that the United States lent its aid to Japan in the Japan-Russian War, and through that aid enabled Japan to humiliate Russia in the hour of that conflict.

Japan to-day is opposing the Asiatic bill touching the question of immigration. She beholds in it the item prohibiting her people from coming into our country while our people assume to go into hers. Likewise, in her new and renewed strength, she beholds the policy of America that excludes her countrymen from the domain of the United States.

China revolts at the humiliation which we have put upon her by holding her people out to the world as unworthy to be of the fellow humankind of America.

Think you, Mr. President, that all of these nations to which I allude, having these grievances, will not bide their time legitimately, from their point of view, to express these grievances in such manner as is natural to humankind? Shall America pass into an agreeable stupor merely because it is isolated by the seas, and feel itself secure from all assault, and be unconscious of these wrongs which other countries feel we have visited upon them? And shall we be indifferent to the already awakened mind on the part of these countries, and to the executions we now see in Europe by nations on the nations against which they were aggrieved?

Sir, it is because of these things I recount, these instances I recite, that our countrymen should be awakened to the fact that America should awake. Sir, America is not preparing to assail any people. America is not presenting a war measure here for attack on anyone, or a measure looking to maintaining a war upon the theory of enmity against any people. But it is because of the knowledge that, being compelled, soon or late, to assert American rights, she is conscious that these rights will be opposed individually, perhaps jointly, combinedly, by those countries having the power when they come out of this war, to meet us in such manner that, if we are not at least prepared to oppose, we shall suffer the humiliation which no American can endure without feeling the death of honor within him.

Mr. President, it is because of these surroundings that our countrymen must mark well the real situation in which now stands America. We well might paraphrase Malcolm to Macduff:

Stands Scotland where it did?

And ask, "Does America stand where she was?" Where is the philosophy of those fathers who spoke about the safety of the United States in the great isolation of America? Sirs, America is in greater danger to-day through these isolations than she ever had protection. Every hour in this country has given civilization the opportunity to increase its methods by which it has put the United States between the two great forces that may be the foes of this Nation—Europe on the west, Asia to the east—and, sir, far from the seas being a source of our protection, they will on either side of us be occupied by the forces of antagonism, by navy and aerial machines, and we destined to find ourselves between them all. All with a common interest at that particular time to defeat the objects which America has declared shall be her policy for the future.

Let me advert to one. My eminent friend, the distinguished chairman of the committee, referred a moment past to the Monroe doctrine. I view the operation of that doctrine differently from the eminent chairman. If I may be permitted, sir, I press to your consideration where I feel our future difficulty lies; and I use the word "difficulty" conscious that a stronger word may be very appropriately adopted.

COURSE OF MONROE DOCTRINE.

There south of us is South America. In Brazil, Germany has large possessions. We are speaking to-day of Chilean nitrates. In Chile, England has large control. In Argentina, Italy has large possessions. Throughout different parts of South America Europe has moved. When this war is over in Europe, Mr. President, as I see it, these countries will demand to enter into South America in such form of colonization as the South American countries themselves will accept. South America, needing capital and feeling that these advances of aid from Europe would be to her interest, will be found accepting those proffers in many instances. Already South America resents what she feels to be the assumption on the part of America of guardianship over her, as if she were of the tutelage of children. She does not

approve the Monroe doctrine further than this—that if the hour shall come when she shall need our aid she may be permitted to invoke it with the assurance that we will respond. But, sir, she resents that we should enter with our authority into her country at any time to say to any people, "Thus far and no farther," when she herself has made no protest. Consequently, sir, from South America and Central America, in view of what has transpired touching the Panama Canal and Nicaragua and through American administrations in Haiti and San Domingo and portions of the Central American countries around us, the United States will receive little sympathy indeed, as I view it, for the enforcement of our present day Monroe doctrine. As we have announced it as a policy of protection and guardianship of these countries, it will be resented. It will not be accepted. Therefore, sir, these southern nations will be found giving such aid to these European countries as will attempt to colonize there as that aid may indicate to the South American country to be profitable to it. All this opposing our effort to maintain the Monroe doctrine against European or Asiatic royal governments.

Then the hour will clearly come upon this my country, as I see it, when, confronted by these European foes, unless we shall compose our difference—as I pray heaven we shall—in treaties of peace and peaceful arrangements—we shall be surrounded with these awakened European enmities, these aroused animosities, these multiplied oppositions, with their long-increased grievances, all centered—as their announced point of expression in the opposition before the world to our assuming to interfere in lands which are no part of our country and by power without right. That we are doing such against the desire of these lands themselves. Then under that theme and under that theory of grievance they will vent grudges they have long espoused against us. The Orient, feeling the indignity that we have by our past course visited, and by present purpose threatens to visit, upon it, burns to join our foes to the end of forcing our abandonment of our exclusion policies. It may be that these Asiatic nations have long since endured their exclusion, but keep this in mind: I do prophesy here this day that Japan will shortly be found making such arrangements with China as will put China under her legislative and official protection. Then Japan will announce to America and to the world a Japanese Monroe doctrine. This shall have for its purpose the retaliation upon America for the Monroe doctrine enforced in Mexico against Japan and in South America against the European countries. Then Japan's policy will be: "Asia for the Asiatics"; American people and American trade will be forced out of Asia. China will likewise be glad of the hour when she can resent the affront that she feels has been visited upon her by America, and if not through herself, then by cooperation with Japan, arise to an independent nation capable of establishing her people in any land they choose to adopt. It may be true, sir, as the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] now remarks, that they have long endured our policy of exclusion. It may be true, sir, that they have yielded to it, and in well-known instances obeyed it; but that they have felt it as a wrong, and are still conscious that we will not yield up the policy. But that does not lessen the buried feeling that they have, and the hour then waits. They stand muttering through Byron:

If we do but watch the hour,
There never yet was human power
Which could evade, if unforgiven,
The patient search and vigil long
Of him who treasures up a wrong.

Then, Mr. President, with these surrounding conditions that must submit themselves to our thoughtful consideration shall we falter here and continue with this debate, on subjects however commendable yet quite apart and foreign to the main measure in hand? Shall we continue such and by such notify the country at large that we have not courage to pass these measures; shall we by our hesitancy indicate that we have been frightened by our own people? I pray we shall consider the aspect we are tendering to the Nation and contemplate the conclusions which may be drawn from it.

Mr. President, the future before us is filled with all uncertainty and to mankind much mystery. If the decree of our administration would be to secure to humanity that which we ask for ourselves, then, sir, toward that object let us prepare. If the policy shall be to enforce for America wherever an American is the rights of an American, let us in haste move toward that purpose. But, sir, whatever the course, let us now have the country see that we are rapidly legislating to enforce these rights, and that we are prepared to do so.

Mr. President, there may be many provisions in this bill that certain Senators might not agree to, but let us move to the consideration of the bill. Let us move to amend, let us move, if

you please, to correction, but let us move to the measure that our country may not be prejudiced by our course, and that our course may not mislead those whose deductions from our present situation may license them then to further assaults upon our rights, seriously complicating our situation and making it more difficult for us to work it out in peace and in security.

Therefore, may I take the liberty to urge what I really rose to present to my distinguished fellow Senators, the doctrine that as to this passage of measures of preparation, let our text be, "If it were done when 'tis done, 'twere well 'twere done quickly"?

I thank the Senate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I have no intention whatever to reply to or comment upon the speech of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] as a whole. It stands for itself and, of course, voices his opinions, very eloquently stated, on the subjects that he discussed. But having in mind what he said in the earlier part of his address about Mexico, I wish to make one observation only, and I am done.

I wish to say that the proposal to increase the Army or Navy of the United States, or both, has no special reference whatever to the troubles in Mexico. I would have the people of Mexico understand that much. The movement to increase the military and naval power of the United States would have been just as it is even though happily Mexico was one wide field of peace and prosperity. The President and the Government of the United States desire only peace with Mexico and to promote the welfare of that Republic.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I am in accord with the views of the Senator from Missouri in that respect. The question of reorganizing and increasing the Army began to be discussed over a year ago, shortly after the European war commenced, not with a view of engaging in war with any power but simply for the purpose of placing our country in a position of absolute defense.

Mr. President, I am in thorough accord with the distinguished Senator from Illinois in his desire to have us move toward the consideration of this bill. We have been at it now for more than a week. There has been no attempt made to limit debate or the offering of suggestions or amendments, but it seems to me, as has been well said by the Senator from Illinois, we ought now to endeavor to take steps that will bring this measure to a hasty conclusion.

Carrying out the thought of the Senator, I send to the desk the following proposed unanimous-consent agreement and ask that it be entered into.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Oregon asks for the adoption of the following unanimous-consent agreement:

That at not later than 4 o'clock p. m. on Saturday, April 15, 1916, the Senate will proceed to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 12 o'clock m. on Monday, the 10th day of April, 1916, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill, or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule the roll will be called.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Borah	Hardwick	Norris	Stone
Brady	Hughes	Overman	Sutherland
Brandegree	Johnson, Me.	Page	Taggart
Burleigh	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Thomas
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Polindexter	Thompson
Chilton	Kern	Reed	Tillman
Clapp	Lane	Robinson	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Walsh
Cummins	Lewis	Shafroth	Warren
Curtis	Lodge	Sheppard	Weeks
Dillingham	McCumber	Simmons	Williams
du Pont	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.	
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Mich.	
Gore	Myers	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. WALSH. I wish to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. HUSTING] is absent on account of official business.

Mr. LEWIS. I announce the absence of the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. He has been called on official business to the State of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Secretary will again read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent—

That at not later than 4 o'clock p. m. on Saturday, April 15, 1916, the Senate will proceed to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, the 10th day of April, 1916, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I am as anxious as any Senator in this Chamber to bring this bill to a speedy vote. It is not my desire to offer any objection to the proposition to vote upon the bill next Saturday, but the exigencies of the situation with reference to the so-called sugar bill are of such a character that I feel that measure would be jeopardized if its consideration were postponed longer than the coming week. It is my purpose, and I so notified the Senator from Oregon, to move on Monday that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that measure.

The necessity for speedy action on the bill grows out of the fact that on the 1st day of May, unless there shall be congressional action in the meantime, sugar will go upon the free list. It is easy to see if sugar should go upon the free list what would be the result both as affecting the revenues of the country and as affecting importations to this country of foreign sugar.

Ordinarily there would be sufficient time to pass the measure even after next week, because I do not suppose it will provoke any great debate in the Senate; but, Mr. President, the House has passed the bill upon one theory with reference to the extension of the duty, and the Finance Committee of the Senate has reported the bill providing for a different method looking toward the taxation of sugar. It is, therefore, evident that when the bill has been passed in this body, if the proposition of the Senate committee is adopted, there will be a sharp conflict between the House and the Senate conferees which may be somewhat prolonged; and when the matter comes back to the Senate, if the proposition of the Senate should not be sustained by the conferees—and of course we can not tell about that—a situation might be developed here which would lead to prolonged debate. The temptation might be created to make that debate so prolonged as ultimately to defeat any legislation looking to the extension of the duties upon sugar.

Under those circumstances, without at least casting upon the Finance Committee responsibility and blame in case there should be a failure, I do not feel that I can with safety consent to this proposition unless it is made clear that the agreement shall not interfere with the success of my efforts to secure action upon the sugar bill next week.

I wish to ask the Chair whether, if this unanimous-consent proposition is agreed to, it would preclude me from offering a motion on Monday or some subsequent day during the week to proceed to the consideration of the sugar bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the present occupant of the chair it would not preclude the suggested action. The only matter that binds the Senate in connection with the unanimous-consent agreement is that it shall vote on a certain hour of a certain day.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think the Chair is clearly right. I simply wanted the ruling of the Chair upon that point.

The only other matter which might possibly affect the purpose I have in view, by reason of the very short time that will be left for debate upon this bill, is the difficulty to carve out of the time allotted in this proposition one or two days next week, and it might interfere with the success of my motion to displace this measure with the sugar bill. I felt I ought to notify the Senate that if there is any feeling or purpose on the part of Senators to defeat the proposition to take up the sugar bill because of the short time fixed in the unanimous-consent agreement, I have had it in mind to suggest to the Senator from Oregon that he make the time a little longer.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, would it not meet the situation if an agreement could be entered into that if any number of days, one or more, should be occupied next week in the consideration of the bill referred to by the Senator from North Carolina that much additional time should be added to the consideration of the Army bill and the day fixed for voting postponed accordingly?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I wish to suggest that if the Senator from Oregon would ask for that portion of the unanimous-consent agreement which limits debate to 10 minutes and postpone the question of a day certain to vote until the sugar measure is disposed of we would likely make time by following that course. If the debate is limited to 10 minutes we will dispose of a vast part of the measure between now and the time

when the sugar bill will come up, at 2 o'clock some day next week.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, no one can be more anxious than I am for the speedy disposition of the Army bill, and I am entirely ready to consent to any agreement that will facilitate the disposition of that measure. But, Mr. President, we ought to take immediate action on the sugar bill. There we are confronted by a date. If on the 1st of May the bill has not passed the Houses and been signed by the President sugar will come in free and the Government will lose the revenue. There are many hundreds of tons of sugar, I am told, now in storage in New York awaiting the chance of the proposed law failing.

Mr. SMOOT. Thousands of tons.

Mr. LODGE. I have no doubt there is as much as that. All that revenue would be lost to the country at a time when it is admitted by the very friends of the bill here that revenue is greatly needed. It seems to me that it is the duty of us all to see that the sugar bill is disposed of and disposed of so that there can be no possibility of its failing before the 1st of May.

Therefore I am very glad the Senator from North Carolina has given the notice he has given. I sincerely hope that it will not interfere with the request of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator I have no disposition in the world to delay the consideration of that revenue measure. I realize, with other Senators, its importance. It is a matter that ought to be acted on promptly, and I have not intended to interfere with its consideration within the limits required. What I am particularly anxious about, Mr. President, is to try to have a limitation upon debate and to have a time set when this measure shall be acted on. I am not particular about whether it is next Saturday or a week from next Saturday, so far as that is concerned. If we can agree on a time when it shall be disposed of, if the Senate is willing to make a unanimous-consent agreement at all, and it is postponed even a week longer, I will be perfectly satisfied.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator understands, of course, that I am not objecting to the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I realize that.

Mr. LODGE. I entirely assent to it, but I wanted to call attention to the fact that I think the Senator from North Carolina is bound to call up that bill. I think it is his duty to do so, and I think the Senate ought to take it up and dispose of it next week.

Mr. HARDWICK. I wish to inquire of the Senator from Oregon, because I am not familiar with the terms of the proposed agreement, whether his proposal to limit debate to 10 minutes is to take effect after Monday?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The proposition is to make it take effect beginning on Monday.

Mr. HARDWICK. I just want to say that I hope he will modify that. I have one amendment, to which I have given a great deal of time, and it will take me more than 10 minutes to present it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let me make—

Mr. HARDWICK. It will not take me very much more than 10 minutes. I am not a lengthy speaker.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The suggestion of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] I think is a good one, that for the present we limit debate, beginning Tuesday at 12 o'clock instead of Monday at 12 o'clock, and cut out the time as to voting.

Mr. HARDWICK. Of course, if the Senator will pardon me, there would be this trouble about that suggestion: If the sugar bill comes in on Monday, then we would have no opportunity to have more than 10 minutes on any one amendment upon the Army bill. I wish to say this to the Senator and the Senate: I have not served a very great length of time in this body, as the Senator knows. As a rule, I do not make lengthy speeches. I do not imagine it would take me more than 20 minutes, but I can not present the proposition in 10 minutes, and I do not intend to try to do so. If the agreement were modified so as to allow me 20 or 30 minutes, I would be content.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think it is important that the agreement to vote on the so-called military bill at a fixed time be entered. I think the agreement asked by the Senator from Oregon ought to be made now in order that Senators may have notice in advance of the time when the vote will be taken. The only difficulty may be easily obviated, so far as the Senator from Georgia is concerned, by agreeing that the agreement shall take effect at 2 o'clock next Monday.

Mr. HARDWICK. Unless the sugar bill, if the Senator will pardon me, took up the time. Then the agreement would hold me down to 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON. That difficulty can also be obviated by agreeing that at noon Monday the Senate shall proceed with the consideration of this bill, if that is necessary, and that no other business should be in order, and that at 2 o'clock the limitation as to the length of speeches shall take effect.

The bill suggested by the Senator from North Carolina undoubtedly ought to be disposed of very promptly, and I had not understood that it would require any great length of time to determine that matter in the Senate. I think it is important that the Senate should proceed with these measures as speedily as possible. We have had a great many interesting speeches here touching a variety of subjects during the time this military bill has been under consideration, and we have digressed from it to consider other questions which are of themselves of great importance. It is an abuse that exists in the Senate, as all of us realize. Our debate ought to be shortened in some way, and there ought not to be an objection to entering into this agreement.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am very sorry that the Senator from Arkansas imputes such conduct to me as that. I for one shall have to be the judge as to whether there ought to be an objection made, and I simply can not agree to a proposition like this that confines me to a 10-minute presentation—

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

Mr. HARDWICK. I am not yielding.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will not the Senator yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Not for the present. I want to make a statement myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia declines to yield.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will not agree to any proposition after we have taken up other amendments and devoted days and weeks almost to some of them, under which I can not get for what I regard the most important amendment that will be offered to the bill more than 10 minutes in which to present it.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator entirely misunderstood me. My suggestion was that an agreement be entered into which would give the Senator two hours.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not want that. I have already suggested—

Mr. ROBINSON. That was the agreement I suggested, and the Senator from Oregon indicated his assent to it. I am utterly at a loss to understand the process of the Senator's mind by which he has reached the conclusion that I was in any way antagonizing him.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am not responsible for the Senator's difficulty in understanding.

Mr. ROBINSON. Perhaps not.

Mr. HARDWICK. The effect of the agreement proposed by the Senator from Oregon is that if the pending amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina takes until 2 o'clock on Monday, I could not have more than 10 minutes to present my amendment. I do not think I shall need more than 20 minutes, but I can not agree to any proposal that will deny me that.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator he can speak 20 minutes, 10 minutes on the bill and 10 minutes on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inquire of the Senator from Oregon whether he has modified his request? If so, it ought to be stated in its present form.

Mr. HARDWICK. I should like to have it stated exactly as it is proposed.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Secretary will read the proposed agreement as modified.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator from Oregon. Evidently in preparing this agreement the Senator had in view to allow a week for discussion upon this bill. I am sure the sugar bill will not take over two days. I believe we can get through with it in one day. My idea would be, if there was any prospect of getting the bill through on Monday, to hold a night session Monday and finish it up; but I am sure we can get through with it in a couple of days. Let me suggest to the Senator from Oregon that he change the time stated in the proposed agreement so as to allow a week after Tuesday for discussion on the Army bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me finish, if the Senator please. And to accommodate the views of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] I suggest that we begin the application of the 10-minute rule on Thursday instead of Wednesday, which would be the next day after the sugar bill was disposed of, if it should take two days.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, of course if that is satisfactory to the Senator having the bill in charge I shall not object, but I

was going to suggest that there are two or three Senators who desire to make speeches of 20 or 30 minutes, or perhaps one of three-quarters of an hour, and why would it not be better for the Senator from North Carolina to give notice now that he will call up the sugar bill on Tuesday?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I do not want to lose another day.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is not any more anxious to pass that bill than I am, and I do not believe that the postponement would make a particle of difference as to the bill. Then we could use all day Monday in the delivery of speeches on the Army bill that it would take some time to deliver and agree upon a 10-minute limit to apply after Monday.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator must see that the very same purpose he has in view will be accomplished by the suggestion I made a little while ago. Instead of limiting debate to 10 minutes, beginning on Monday, fix the time for limiting debate to 10 minutes on Thursday. That would give all day Wednesday, if it takes us two days to pass the sugar bill, to general unlimited debate. If we can pass it in one day, it would give two days for unlimited debate.

Mr. SMOOT. If it takes two days, then there will not be any time at all left. That is what I was trying to avoid.

Mr. SIMMONS. I said not Wednesday, but Thursday, to begin the operation of the 10-minute rule.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to that. I was only trying to get a time fixed, so that Senators could speak on the bill now.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, this difficulty suggests itself to me with regard to the proposition of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. His supposition is a very probable one—that the sugar bill will be disposed of within two days; but there is always in this body, in any event, the possibility that a longer amount of time will be consumed, and properly consumed, in the consideration of a bill. I have this suggestion to make: That we take up the sugar bill and devote the evenings of next week to its consideration, so that our day sessions can be devoted, just as they have been, to the consideration of the Army bill. There is no reason in the world why we should not come here at 8 o'clock every evening and consider and dispose of the sugar bill. That proceeding would have the double effect, perhaps, Mr. President, of not interfering with the present pending business and, at the same time, of shortening the debates upon the sugar bill on the part of those who may object to such a strenuous procedure.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. Just one word. I would not have any objection to the plan proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] except for the fact that, if we only devote night sessions to the discussion of the sugar bill, it might take us a week to pass it, because we might be troubled about questions of quorums and all that sort of thing, at the will of any Senator who might oppose the proposed legislation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator, Why would it not be well now to ask unanimous consent to close debate on the sugar bill at a certain time?

Mr. SIMMONS. I was just about to ask the Chair, as a parliamentary inquiry, whether it would be in order for me at this time to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed on Monday next with the consideration of the sugar bill, and that by unanimous consent a vote be taken thereon at 5 o'clock on Tuesday?

Mr. STONE. At not later than 5 o'clock.

Mr. SIMMONS. At not later than 5 o'clock on Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In answer to the inquiry of the Senator from North Carolina, the present occupant of the chair will say that he is of opinion that it is competent to have a unanimous-consent agreement to that effect, to vote at a certain hour of the day.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection, I will say to the Senator from North Carolina, to his asking for any agreement that the Senate may reach as a part of this unanimous-consent agreement; but I am not going to give up the right of way here, unless the Senate takes it away from me, unless I can have some understanding about the disposition of the bill now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inquire of the Senator from Oregon whether he proposes to modify the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. SIMMONS. I will offer this as an amendment to the unanimous-consent agreement—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator from North Carolina first rises and objects here to a proposal that I offered to the Senate, and I think it comes with rather poor grace from him to now come and undertake to sidetrack an attempt to get a unanimous-consent agreement as to the other. I have expressed the desire,

Mr. President, to help the Senator from North Carolina get consideration of the sugar bill, but I do not feel very patient about having him undertake to sidetrack the proposition which I have submitted to the Senate in favor of the proposition which he makes.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to assure the Senator from Oregon that I had no such thought in my mind, and I did not make this request to interfere with him in the slightest degree. I am glad he made the request, and I am willing to offer my request for unanimous consent as an amendment to his request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from North Carolina permit the amended request for a unanimous-consent agreement to be now read?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will now be read by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. It is agreed by unanimous consent that, at not later than 4 o'clock p. m. on Tuesday, April 18, 1916, the Senate will proceed to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the House bill 12766, to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 12 o'clock meridian on Thursday, April 13, 1916, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry of the Senator from North Carolina. Suppose that under that arrangement the sugar bill is taken up on Monday or Tuesday and continues for two weeks, what would happen to amendments that are to be proposed to the military bill?

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from Iowa probably did not hear all of my proposition. It was that we should take up the sugar bill on Monday and proceed to its consideration on Monday at 12 o'clock, and that a final vote should be taken on the bill and on all amendments thereto not later than 5 o'clock on Tuesday.

Mr. CUMMINS. If that element is put into the unanimous-consent agreement, I have no objection whatever to it; but that is not now in the agreement.

Mr. SIMMONS. I offer that as an amendment to the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. Is a proposed unanimous-consent agreement subject to be amended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a precedent where five unanimous-consent agreements were agreed upon at the same time.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I can understand that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] can modify his own proposed unanimous-consent agreement to suit himself; but that the Senate by a majority vote can amend a unanimous-consent agreement is something of which I had not heard.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understood the Senator from Oregon to say that he would accept the amendment, that it might be incorporated in his proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and that we vote at one time upon the proposition as amended.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Then it would become a part of the Senator's own proposition and, of course, that would be perfectly proper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will take the liberty of calling attention to the fact that, while the precedents do not bind, yet when the Canadian reciprocity agreement was under consideration a unanimous-consent agreement was made to vote on that bill, a unanimous-consent agreement was made to vote on the wool bill, a unanimous-consent agreement was made to vote on the farmers' free-list bill, a unanimous-consent agreement was made to vote on the apportionment of representation bill, and a unanimous-consent agreement was made to vote upon the question of the admission of New Mexico and Arizona; but they were to take effect on different days and at different hours, of course. So the Chair has suggested that it would now be competent to reach a unanimous-consent agreement to vote upon the sugar bill as well as upon the bill now under consideration.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] will make the 10-minute rule begin on Friday, instead of on Thursday, I shall have no objection to the agreement.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senate will consent to a recess until 11 o'clock on Monday morning and on Tuesday morning of next week, I shall have no objection to the agreement.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from North Carolina state his request?

Mr. SIMMONS. It is that at noon on Monday next the Senate proceed to the consideration of the sugar bill and the amendments thereto, and that not later than 4 o'clock on Tuesday there shall be a vote upon—

Mr. THOMAS. Say 5 o'clock.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no objection to 5 o'clock. I would, however, rather have it 4 o'clock; but if the Senator insists upon it being 5 o'clock—

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I want to dispose of the bill and am just as anxious to do so as is the chairman of the committee; but I think there should be some time for discussion.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Make it 5 o'clock.

Mr. SIMMONS. Well, make it 5 o'clock. I ask that the Secretary place the remainder of the agreement in the usual form.

Mr. LODGE. And that the Senate recess on Monday to 11 o'clock on Tuesday.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes. If the Senator from Oregon agrees to that, it is perfectly satisfactory to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will now state the request as amended.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 4 o'clock p. m. on Tuesday, April 18, 1916, the Senate will proceed to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, April 14, 1916, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

And it is further agreed by unanimous consent that, at not later than 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, April 10, 1916, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill H. R. 11471, an act to amend an act entitled "An act to reduce the tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913, and that at not later than 5 o'clock p. m. on Tuesday, April 11, 1916, the Senate will proceed to vote upon any amendment that may then be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMMONS. I think the words "without further debate" should be included.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from North Carolina a question. I do not exactly understand the proposal. I desire to inquire how much time will intervene between the close of the consideration and vote on the sugar bill and the time when debate and consideration of the military bill shall close?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. A week.

Mr. SIMMONS. Just one week.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I ask that the proposed agreement be modified so that debate shall close on the sugar bill at 5 o'clock on Tuesday, April 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request for unanimous consent will be modified in that respect.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The words "without further debate" should be added.

The SECRETARY. So as to read:

Shall vote without further debate.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I ask for a division of this question, so that there may be a separate presentation of each part of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Senator's privilege. The question will first be put upon the request for unanimous consent proposed by the Senator from Oregon. Is there objection?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to submit a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair. I inquire whether or not under the proposition contained in this request all debate would be precluded upon amendments offered to the bill after the hour of 4 o'clock on April 14th?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Chair will reply that debate will be in order on amendments offered.

Mr. POINDEXTER. A further inquiry. The language of the request is that at that hour we shall proceed to vote upon the bill and amendments. I understand the Chair holds that debate will be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the 10-minute rule.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Under the 10-minute rule.

Mr. JONES. I understand debate will not be in order after the time set for voting; but after Friday, April 14, until April

18, debate under the 10-minute rule will be in order. After 4 o'clock on the 18th, however, we can not, under the proposed agreement, debate any amendment that may be pending.

Mr. POINDEXTER. After 4 o'clock on the 18th?

Mr. JONES. After 4 o'clock on the 18th, when we begin to vote, debate shall not be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is right in that respect, that on the 18th after 4 o'clock debate shall not be in order.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I think that I will have to object to the request in that form. It seems to me that the five-minute rule at least ought to be in order upon amendments that may be offered to the bill. It would be rather unsatisfactory if amendments which may occur to Senators shall not even be subject to explanation or to any debate whatever. So, I ask the Senator from Oregon to modify his request by providing that Senators shall not speak more than once or longer than five minutes upon the bill or any amendment after the hour of 4 o'clock on the 18th of April.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection to that, Mr. President. It is desired to get a date fixed when we may dispose of this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that change will be made in the proposed unanimous-consent agreement. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement covering House bill 12766 as finally entered into is as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 4 o'clock p. m. on Tuesday, April 18, 1916, the Senate will proceed to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States, through the regular parliamentary stages, to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, April 14, 1916, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill, or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto; and, further, that after the hour of 4 o'clock p. m. on Tuesday, April 18, 1916, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 5 minutes upon any amendment pending or offered to the said bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Now, is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I make the same observation with reference to that request.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thought that the agreement was all one.

Mr. LODGE. It is all one agreement, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has asked for a division.

Mr. LODGE. How is it possible to divide a proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the Senator from Massachusetts is wrong about that.

Mr. LODGE. But the second agreement, if it may be called so, came to us as a part of the first agreement, having been accepted by the Senator from Oregon as a modification of his own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will still hold that it is a divisible question.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington insists, I will consent to a modification, so as to provide for the same arrangement concerning debate under the five-minute rule on the sugar bill as was made regarding the military bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for unanimous consent as modified? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement as to House bill 11471 as finally entered into is as follows:

And it is further agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, April 10, 1916, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill H. R. 11471, an act to amend an act entitled "An act to reduce the tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913; and that at not later than 5 o'clock p. m. on Tuesday, April 11, 1916, the Senate will vote upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 5 o'clock p. m. on said day, Tuesday, April 11, 1916, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than five minutes upon any amendment pending or that may be offered to the said bill.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, in view of what has been said with reference to the National Guard being represented in Washington by a lobby, and also what has been said in reference to the position of Gen. O'Ryan on the subject of a Volunteer Army, I ask leave to have incorporated in the Reconnaissance a communication in behalf of the executive committee of the National Guard Association of the United States, Gen. Foster, and also an article from the New York Times of to-day, showing Gen. O'Ryan's position on the subject of the Volunteer Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Edwitt Hotel, Washington, April 8, 1916.

HON. BLAIR LEE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LEE: The charge that the National Guard is represented in Washington by a lobby, and that it is seeking by improper means to influence the action of Congress, with regard to pending military legislation, would not call for comment if it had emanated from a less important source. As that charge has been made, it seems proper and necessary that this committee make a statement with regard to that matter.

The National Guard Association of the United States is a representative organization which meets annually in convention made up of delegates selected upon a basis of 1 for each 500 or fraction thereof of organized troops. Its object is to promote this branch of the National Military Establishment, and practically all of the Federal legislation dealing with the militia which has been enacted in recent years has been initiated by this organization. During the interim between its conventions the affairs of the association are conducted by an executive committee, and it may be stated in passing that guardsmen do not seek positions upon this committee; they are selected for that duty, and if they serve they do so at some personal expense and sacrifice.

The members of this executive committee appeared before the Military Committees of Congress at the hearings which were held prior to the formulation of the bills which have since been introduced in the House and Senate. Some of the members of this committee have been here since, during the progress of the pending military legislation. If excuse for their presence within the precincts of this sacred city is required, it may be said that they are here at the suggestion and request of Members of both the Senate and House who are not only interested in the National Guard, but who are earnestly trying to preserve that institution against the assaults of those who would destroy it.

When the House military bill had been introduced the members of the National Guard executive committee met here and spent a week in careful consideration of those of its features dealing with their branch of the service and they submitted to Mr. HAY and to the members of his committee certain suggested amendments which they felt would improve the National Guard sections of the bill. The chairman of the House committee graciously gave the National Guard representatives a hearing, and while he did not accept all of the suggestions which were made, every opportunity was afforded them for consultation and discussion. A similar course was followed with the Senate bill when it was finally introduced. On March 18 certain amendments proposed by this committee were submitted to Senator CHAMBERLAIN with request that they be considered and that opportunity be given to present to him the reasons which prompted their suggestion. This communication was not acknowledged nor replied to. I think it must be admitted that our committee was not unduly insistent in pressing its recommendations upon the notice of the Senate committee.

These recommendations have, however, been brought to the attention of Senators through National Guardsmen of their own States, and, for the most part, have now been offered in the Senate as amendments to the Senate bill.

Inquiry suggests itself as to what constitutes a "bald" or "insidious" lobby.

We may without disadvantage, I think, compare the activities of the National Guard committee with those of other organizations and interests and "movements" concerned with the same legislation. What the "bald lobby" of the National Guard has done has already been stated. Here are some of the things it has not done:

Those composing it have not sought to interview or called upon any Senator or Representative except when specially invited to do so. The writer has not written or spoken to either Senator or the Representatives from his own State upon the subject of military legislation, a privilege that probably would not have been denied him.

No printed matter has been gotten out or circulated.
No headquarters is maintained; no publicity agent is employed or other medium for extending propaganda.

The Members of Congress have not been circularized and their mail has not been burdened with letters from this committee.

The above humiliating confession as to the further defects in the National Guard system, indicating lack of efficiency in the methods of influencing legislation which are recognized and practiced by the experts, is unwillingly wrung from us.

On the other hand, practically every other branch of the military service has its "league" for promotion, with established offices and paid publicity agents actively at work in extending its propaganda. The president of one of the patriotic preparedness leagues recently employed a whole page in a Washington paper to warn the House of Representatives against legislating for the development of the National Guard and sent each Member one or more letters.

Presumably that newspaper space was not donated for the purpose. The organization referred to and the many others of similar character rendered kin by a system of interlocking directorates which would put the Standard Oil system to blush is expending thousands of dollars in extending its propaganda against the long-established volunteer military system of the country in favor of conscription and compulsory military service.

Hundreds of telegrams have been received within the last few days in the Senate from various sources and complacently placed in the RECORD as evidence of the patriotic purpose of the senders, but telegrams from National Guardsmen were made the basis for scathing denunciation. If it is an offense against the peace of the Nation and the dignity of the Senate for the Members of that body to be made acquainted by telegram with the views of their constituents who are guardsmen, upon matters of pending legislation, let the excuse offered by the executive committee of the Military Training Camp Association for similar action, as quoted in the New York Times of Thursday, be accepted also for the offending guardsmen. The "Plattsburg" representatives said: "It has been our consistent policy to keep out of politics and legislative activities, but when it becomes a matter of self-preservation, such as is this, it is not only proper but absolutely necessary that we take measures to protect the future of the movement."

The relationship between the military training camp project and the continental army scheme is thus for the first time officially disclosed. If a policy alleged to attach to a mere "movement" can gain consistency in a year, something may be said for the record of an institu-

tion which for more than a hundred years has practiced similar rectitude and repression, and, with small encouragement, has worked to keep alive the military spirit of our people "during the many years of our national indifference on the subject of preparedness," as the Senate Military Committee has very fairly expressed it.

If Congress be desirous of identifying the military influences to which it is willingly and unwillingly subjected, we suggest the simple expedient of a statute requiring all who receive pay or emoluments in the military service of the Government to wear the uniform while in Washington. If this were done, my dear Senator, it may be safely predicted that the much-dreaded National Guard "lobby" would be lost sight of in the crowd.

For more than two years the National Guard representatives stood on the steps at the War Department and urged the Secretary of War to recommend to Congress those measures for the improvement of their service, which they and all of the agencies of the War Department had agreed were consistent and necessary. During that time they were repeatedly told by the former Secretary of War that they might go direct to Congress with their proposals; but, believing that the National Guard is sustained for its Federal uses and that its needs should be presented by the head of the War Department, the same as is done for the Army, the suggestion was not acted upon until all other doors stood closed. The National Guard has now come to Congress. Openly and not without confidence, because sure of the justice and wisdom of what it proposes. With due regard to our respective official relationships we have been scrupulously careful to observe the amenities of the situation, as we understand them and as they have been revealed to us. Conscious of no inconsistent action and being actuated by motives which we know to be proper and which we believe to be patriotic, we protest against misrepresentation and unjust denunciation by those who, as the representatives of the Government we seek to serve, we have the right to look for fair treatment and reasonable consideration.

Due to the fact that the National Guard has not advertised its virtues and has left its enemies free to proclaim its deficiencies, there is no institution of the American Government which at this time is more generally misunderstood, more incorrectly estimated, and more persistently and maliciously misrepresented. Knowing this, we can the better appreciate the attitude of yourself and others in Congress who are supporting our branch of the service and speaking in its defense.

Very sincerely, yours,

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL
GUARD ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
J. CLIFFORD R. FOSTER, Chairman.

[From the New York Times of Apr. 8, 1916.]

GEN. O'RYAN ASSAILS VOLUNTEER ARMY PLAN—DENIES HIS LETTER INDORSED IT—NATIONAL GUARD AT WAR WITH TRAINING CAMP LEADERS.

The breach that separates the two groups most interested in the Army legislation now pending in Congress, one group being composed of the officers of the National Guard and those in sympathy with them and the other group comprising the men who attended the training camps held last year and numerous officers of the Regular Army, is widening to the point where the two groups are almost openly at war. Section 56 of the Chamberlain bill, which creates a "volunteer army" separate and distinct from the National Guard organization as provided for in section 58, is the cause of the division.

The National Guardsmen almost to a man maintain that the existence of the two forces at the same time is impossible, because, as an officer of the New York Guard expressed it yesterday, it requires "two bodies with identical functions to occupy the same space at the same time." Among the officers none is more outspoken in his opposition to the "volunteer army" than Maj. Gen. John F. O'Ryan, commanding the National Guard of this State. He said yesterday that he believed that section 56 of the Chamberlain bill was backed by "a strong ultra-military group, who can see nothing good in the way of preparedness except a huge Regular Army, supported by conscription."

The letter written to Senator O'GORMAN by Col. Henry S. Sternburger, chief quartermaster on the staff of Gen. O'Ryan, which Senator O'GORMAN interpreted as a command to vote for the elimination of the "volunteer army" provision of the Chamberlain bill, is approved by the great majority of guard officers in New York. In the opinion of brother officers, Col. Sternburger was within his rights when he wrote that letter, in which, among other things, he said:

"I shall use my influence, not only with the National Guardsmen but with all citizens with whom I come into contact, toward pointing out to them that the so-called continental army scheme is impracticable and will have a bad effect if passed."

Gen. O'Ryan did not say so, but it is believed that he indorsed every word that Col. Sternburger wrote.

Senator O'GORMAN, in expressing in the Senate Thursday his disapproval of Col. Sternburger's utterances, stated that Gen. O'Ryan had written on January 17 a letter stating that the volunteer army provision would not impair the efficiency of the National Guard. Gen. O'Ryan said yesterday that he was at a loss to understand how such an interpretation could be placed upon the letter referred to, which relates to training camps, and not to any volunteer army such as is proposed in the Chamberlain bill.

GEN. O'RYAN'S VIEWS.

"The letter referred to as having been written by me," said Gen. O'Ryan, "was doubtless a letter written to Gen. Wood or Capt. Johnson of his staff, commanding the Plattsburg training camp, and suggesting the cooperation of the National Guard regimental commanders. The letter had no reference to the Federal Army proposition."

"The officers of the National Guard generally throughout the country do not believe in the wisdom of the volunteer army provision of the Chamberlain bill, and I am of the opinion that this sentiment is not based on selfish grounds, for if there is any unselfish aggregation of men in this country it is the army made up of the officers and men composing the National Guard. Their practical spirit of self-sacrifice over a long period of years has demonstrated this. They believe the provision referred to unwise, because they think there is a strong ultra-military group who can see nothing good in the way of preparedness except a huge Regular Army, supported by conscription, and that the opposition to the reorganization of the National Guard as a Federal force is fostered by this element."

"They further believe that the volunteer army provision, while resulting in nothing practical in the way of creating an efficient fighting force, will nevertheless create a new organization to assist in fighting the National Guard—a force to be later discarded as evidence of an honest but fruitless attempt to develop a force other than by conscrip-

tion. They believe that the wealthy men and the professional and business men who constitute the personnel of the training camp associations would not enlist in a volunteer army any more than they would enlist in the National Guard; or, if they did, it would be for the sole purpose of attempting to give the organization a start, after which they would drop out. They believe that the members of these training camp associations do not realize the probability of this outcome.

"The sentiment of the National Guard is that while the widely advertised shortcomings of the National Guard have been greatly exaggerated, there are faults of organization and insufficient Federal control, all of which will be corrected after the passage of the legislation now pending in Congress, which will give to the National Guard a Federal status.

"I say this is the sentiment of the National Guard as I understand it from correspondence and conversation with officers from all over the country. They feel that they have not had sympathetic support, and some go so far as to state that the recent remarkable increase in efficiency has resulted in increased antagonism on the part of the group referred to. It is to be regretted that this sentiment exists, but that it does exist is not to be denied.

"Some officers who make these criticisms give voluntary acknowledgment of their confidence in the large number of regular officers working with the National Guard, and who believe in the possibilities of its future development under Federal control.

"Personally, I do not believe in the volunteer army provision of the Chamberlain bill, for the reason that it creates an additional category of troops of the same class as the National Guard of the United States under the new bill, and because it will constitute a force that will be worthless without the expenditure of millions of dollars to provide it with facilities, which the National Guard already possesses. An additional objection is the fact that the new force will necessarily be in conflict with the reorganized Federal National Guard in the matters of recruiting and obtaining appropriations for field training and armament. The results could not but be contrary to the best interests of the country.

"Much misinformation exists concerning the effect of the new legislation on the National Guard. If anyone will take the trouble to read the provisions of the bill it will be found that they provide for uniformity in every detail of military organization, discipline, training, armament, and equipment throughout the country."

Other officers at National Guard headquarters in the municipal building stated that Gen. O'Ryan had expressed their views. One of these officers referred to a letter sent to members of the Military Training Camps Association of the United States this week, in which the men who attended the military training camps were asked to telegraph their Senators immediately to support the volunteer army section of the Chamberlain bill, under which section the President would have the power, in discretion, to organize camps similar to the Plattsburg camp in all parts of the country.

"If a Guard officer writes his Senator it is dictation, but if a member of the Training Camps Association telegraphs him, it is a perfectly proper thing to do," was one officer's comment.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon consents that the military bill may be temporarily laid aside so that I may ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 12207, the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 12207) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I want it understood that that will not displace the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not at all. The regular order will be laid aside temporarily. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 12207) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Legislative," subhead "Senate," on page 2, line 13, after "\$6,500," to strike out "hire of horse and wagon for the Secretary's office, \$420"; in line 15, after "\$5,000," to insert "reading clerk, \$3,600"; in line 17, after the words "principal clerk," to strike out "reading clerk," and on page 3, line 4, after the words "in all" to strike out "\$94,230" and insert "\$94,410," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Secretary: Secretary of the Senate, including compensation as disbursing officer of salaries of Senators and of the contingent fund of the Senate, \$6,500; assistant secretary, Henry M. Rose, \$5,000; reading clerk, \$3,600; chief clerk, \$3,250; financial clerk, \$3,000;

minute and journal clerk, principal clerk and enrolling clerk, at \$3,000 each; executive clerk, and assistant financial clerk, at \$2,750 each; librarian, file clerk, chief bookkeeper, assistant journal clerk, and printing clerk, at \$2,500 each; first assistant librarian, and keeper of stationery, at \$2,400 each; assistant librarian, \$1,800; skilled laborer, \$1,200; clerks—3 at \$2,500 each, 4 at \$2,220 each, 2 at \$2,100 each, 1 \$1,800, 2 at \$1,600 each, 1 \$1,440; assistant keeper of stationery, \$2,000; assistant in stationery room, \$1,200; messenger, \$1,440; assistant messenger, \$1,200; laborers—3 at \$840 each, 3 at \$720 each, 1 in stationery room, \$720; in all, \$94,410.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the item of appropriation for "Clerks and messengers to the committees of the Senate," on page 7, line 15, after the words "Rules—clerk," to strike out "\$2,220" and insert: "\$2,720, to include full compensation for the preparation biennially of the Senate Manual, under the direction of the Committee on Rules," and, on page 8, line 3, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$427,880" and insert "\$428,380," so as to read:

Rules—clerk \$2,720, to include full compensation for the preparation biennially of the Senate Manual, under the direction of the Committee on Rules, assistant clerk \$1,800, messenger \$1,440; Standards, Weights, and Measures—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Territories—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,440; Transportation and Sale of Meat Products—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Transportation Routes to the Seaboard—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; University of the United States—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; Woman Suffrage—clerk \$2,220, assistant clerk \$1,440, messenger \$1,200; in all, \$428,380.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 10, after "\$3,000," to insert "two floor assistants, at \$2,000 each," and, in line 12, after "\$1,000," to strike out "two on the floor of the Senate, at \$2,000 each," so as to read:

Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$6,500; Assistant Sergeant at Arms, \$2,500; Assistant Doorkeeper, \$3,000; Acting Assistant Doorkeeper, \$3,000; two floor assistants, at \$2,000 each; messengers—4 (acting as assistant doorkeepers) at \$1,800 each, 32 at \$1,440 each, 1 \$1,050, 1 \$1,000, 1 at card door \$1,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 13, after the word "Foreman," to strike out "\$1,400" and insert "\$1,600," and, in line 15, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$17,720" and insert "\$17,920," so as to make the clause read:

Folding room: Foreman, \$1,600; assistant, \$1,400; clerk, \$1,200; folders—7 at \$1,000 each, 8 at \$840 each; in all \$17,920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 4, after the word "each," to insert "24 assistant clerks, at \$1,200 each," and, in line 6, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$76,800" and insert "\$105,600," so as to make the clause read:

For assistance to Senators who are not chairmen of committees, as follows: Twenty-four clerks, at \$2,000 each; 24 assistant clerks, at \$1,200 each; 24 messengers, at \$1,200 each; in all, \$105,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 11, to strike out:

For maintaining and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails, \$6,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

And to insert:

For maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails and for official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, \$6,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 22, after the word "thousand," to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$10,000," so as to make the clause read:

For folding speeches and pamphlets, at a rate not exceeding \$1 per thousand, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 5, to insert: For rent of warehouse for storage of public documents, \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Library of Congress," on page 22, line 21, after the word "each," where it occurs the second time, to strike out "two" and insert "four," and on page 23, line 4, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$58,020" and insert "\$59,220," so as to make the clause read:

Reading rooms (including evening service) and special collections: Superintendent, \$3,000; assistants—2 at \$1,800 each, 5 at \$1,200 each (including 1 in room for the blind), 2 at charging desk at \$1,080 each, 3 at \$960 each, 10 at \$840 each, 4 at \$600 each; stenographer and typewriter, \$960; attendants—Senate reading room, \$960; Representatives' reading room—1 \$960, 1 \$840, 2 in cloakroom at \$780 each, 1 in Toner Library \$960, 1 in Washington Library \$960, 2 for gallery and alcoves at \$540 each; telephone operator, \$660; 4 junior messengers, at \$420 each; 2 watchmen, at \$780 each; evening service, assistants—5 at \$960 each, 15 at \$840 each, 2 at \$600 each; in all, \$59,220.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 8, after "\$1,500," to insert "assistant, \$900," and in line 9, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$4,920" and insert "\$5,820," so as to make the clause read:

Semitic and Oriental Literature: Chief of division, \$3,000; assistant, \$1,500; assistant, \$900; junior messenger, \$420; in all, \$5,820.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 3, after the word "each," where it occurs the second time, to strike out "two" and insert "three"; in line 4, after the word "each," where it occurs the first time, to strike out "three" and insert "four," and in line 10, after the word "Librarian," to strike out "\$40,900" and insert "\$43,000," so as to make the clause read:

Distribution of card indexes: For service in connection with distribution of card indexes and other publications of the Library: Chief of division, \$3,000; chief assistant, \$1,800; assistants—1 \$1,600, 3 at \$1,500 each, 3 at \$1,400 each, 3 at \$1,200 each, 3 at \$1,100 each, 4 at \$1,000 each; for services of assistants at salaries less than \$1,000 per annum and for piecework and work by the hour, \$17,000, including not exceeding \$500 for freight charges, expressage, traveling expenses connected with such distribution, and expenses of attendance at meetings when incurred on the written authority and direction of the Librarian, \$43,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 6, before the word "watchmen," to strike out "sixteen" and insert "eighteen"; in line 7, before the word "painter," to strike out "carpenter" and insert "two carpenters"; in line 8, before the word "laborers," to strike out "fourteen" and insert "sixteen"; and in line 15, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$77,745" and insert "\$81,525," so as to make the clause read:

Library building and grounds: Superintendent, \$3,000; clerks—1 \$2,000, 1 \$1,600, 1 \$1,400, 1 \$1,000; property clerk, \$900; messenger; assistant messenger; telephone switchboard operator; assistant telephone switchboard operator; captain of watch, \$1,400; lieutenant of watch, \$1,000; 18 watchmen, at \$900 each; 2 carpenters, painter, and foreman of laborers, at \$900 each; 16 laborers, at \$540 each; 2 attendants in ladies' room, at \$480 each; 4 check boys, at \$360 each; mistress of charwomen, \$425; assistant mistress of charwomen, \$300; 58 charwomen; chief engineer, \$1,500; assistant engineers—1 \$1,200, 3 at \$900 each; electrician, \$1,500; machinists—1 \$1,000, 1 \$900; 2 wiremen, at \$900 each; plumber, \$900; 3 elevator conductors, and 10 skilled laborers, at \$720 each; in all, \$81,525.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 2, to insert: For resurfacing west driveway and repairs to stone curb in Library grounds, \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 4, to insert:

For refitting of boiler room and coal vaults, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Botanic Gardens," on page 28, line 11, after the words "Joint Committee on the Library," to strike out "\$17,000" and insert "\$19,500," so as to make the clause read:

For assistants and laborers, under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, \$19,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 14, after the word "supplies," to insert "traveling expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence of the superintendent and his assistants"; in line 17, after the words "Botanic Gardens," to insert "purchase and maintenance of motor-propelled delivery vehicle"; and in line 19, after the words "Joint Library Committee of Congress," to strike out "\$9,000" and insert "\$11,903," so as to make the clause read:

For procuring manure, soil, tools, fuel, purchasing trees, shrubs, plants, and seeds; services, materials, and miscellaneous supplies, traveling expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence of the superintendent and his assistants, street car tickets not exceeding \$25, and contingent expenses in connection with repairs and improvements to Botanic Gardens, purchase and maintenance of motor-propelled delivery vehicle, under direction of the Joint Library Committee of Congress, \$11,903.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Executive," on page 29, line 5, after the word "clerks," to insert "two at \$2,500 each"; in line 6, before the words "of class four," to strike out "six" and insert "five"; in the same line, before the words "of class three," to strike out "three" and insert "two"; in line 8, before the word "at," where it occurs the first time, to strike out "two" and insert "three"; in the same line, before the word "at," where it occurs the second time, to strike out "two" and insert "three"; and in line 9, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$73,440" and insert "\$76,780," so as to make the clause read:

Office of the President: Secretary, \$7,500; executive clerk, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$4,000; appointment clerk, \$3,500; record clerk, \$2,500; 2 expert stenographers, at \$2,500 each; accountant and disbursing clerk, \$2,500; 2 correspondents, at \$2,500 each; clerks—2 at \$2,500 each, 4 at \$2,000 each, 5 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 4 of class 2, 3 of class 1; messengers—3 at \$900 each, 3 at \$840 each; 3 laborers at

\$720 each; in all, \$76,780: *Provided*, That employees of the executive departments and other establishments of the executive branch of the Government may be detailed from time to time to the office of the President of the United States for such temporary assistance as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Civil Service Commission," on page 30, line 19, before the words "of class four," to strike out "six" and insert "seven"; in the same line, before the words "of class three," to strike out "twenty-six" and insert "thirty"; in line 20, before the words "of class two," to strike out "thirty-six" and insert "forty-two"; and on page 31, line 1, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$278,330" and insert "\$294,930," so as to make the clause read:

For commissioner, acting as president of the commission, \$4,500; 2 commissioners, at \$4,000 each; chief examiner, \$3,500; secretary, \$2,500; assistant chief examiner, \$2,250; chiefs of division—3 at \$2,000 each; examiners—1 \$2,400, 3 at \$2,000 each, 6 at \$1,800 each; clerks—7 of class 4, 30 of class 3, 42 of class 2, 52 of class 1, 34 at \$1,000 each, 22 at \$900 each; messenger; assistant messenger; skilled laborer, \$720; 4 messenger boys, at \$360 each. Custodian force: Engineer, \$840; general mechanic, \$840; telephone switchboard operator; 2 firemen; 2 watchmen; 2 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 3 laborers; 4 charwomen; in all, \$294,930.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 2, after the word "commission," to strike out "\$18,000" and insert "\$20,000," so as to make the clause read:

For necessary traveling expenses, including those of examiners acting under the direction of the commission, and for expenses of examinations and investigations held elsewhere than at Washington, and including not exceeding \$1,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of public officials when specifically directed by the commission, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 6, after the word "commission," to strike out "\$5,700" and insert "\$7,500," so as to make the clause read:

For field examiners at the rate of \$1,500 per annum each, for work in connection with members of local boards and other necessary work as directed by the commission, \$7,500.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of State," on page 32, line 9, after "\$12,000," to insert "Undersecretary of State, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, \$7,500"; in line 13, after "4,500," to strike out "Counselor for the department, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, \$7,500"; in line 16, after the word "work," to strike out "four" and insert "five," so as to read:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

For Secretary of State, \$12,000; Undersecretary of State, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, \$7,500; Assistant Secretary, \$5,000; Second and Third Assistant Secretaries, at \$4,500 each; Director of the Consular Service, \$4,500; officers to aid in important drafting work, five at \$4,500 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I notice, so far as the bill has been read, on almost every page the creation apparently of additional clerkships and additional positions of watchmen and messengers. There seems to be, to quite an extent, a multiplication of positions in this bill. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Virginia if he has made any computation as to how many new positions are provided for by the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I can not give the number, but in the aggregate it is small. All the Senate amendments only involve an increase of about half a million dollars. Increases have only been made where they are very necessary, and they are much fewer than were estimated and asked for by the departments. Some increases in the service in some places were absolutely necessary to accomplish efficient work.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, Mr. President, under the situation which every Senator is familiar with, it is absolutely impossible for Senators, with the other duties which they have, to be informed about these matters, and we have to rely—and I do rely—on the committee in charge of them, particularly on the chairman of the committee; but my observation, in going into the various departments here, is that there is no lack of messengers and watchmen. It seems to me, if anything, there is a superfluity of them. The impression that one gets is that, so far as those positions are concerned, those who hold them are suffering for lack of something to do. They seem to spend the day sitting in the corridors; and so it is somewhat surprising to see, on every page in this bill, additional positions of this kind, and other kinds, created.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say to the Senator, Mr. President, that I am sure the committee all feel that if we have erred at all, it was in denying things that were asked, rather than in giving what we have given. The increases are

very often apparent and not real. They are struck off in one place and added in another.

You may take particularly the State Department. There they were paying 93 clerks out of a lump sum, and we discontinued that. We repealed the sections that allowed lump sums for clerks, and made them statutory appointments.

I am sure that if we have erred at all it has been in denying things rather than in allowing too much.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I sincerely hope that is true, Mr. President. Of course, that matter will have to stand upon its merits, and the Senator, no doubt, is assured of the need for these new positions; but it is very surprising.

I should like to ask the Senator further if this entire increase of \$500,000, or the greater part of it, is for these new positions?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Oh, no—a very small part of it, Mr. President. The largest increase is for an increased force for the collection of the income tax.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Can the Senator inform the Senate as to the total amount of the appropriations contained in this bill for the salaries of new positions that are provided for in the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have not a list made up giving that aggregate, but I can assure the Senator that it is not large, and we have pruned it wherever we possibly could. The committee has made a conscientious effort to prevent duplication of service or too liberal a supply of assistants in the departments.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I notice on page 33 of the bill, just turning to it at random, in line 8, that the bill as it came from the House provided for 17 clerks of class 4. The Senate bill provides for 25 of these clerks. In line 9 the House bill provided for 19 clerks of class 3. The Senate bill provides for 26 clerks of class 3. In the same line and in line 10, 25 clerks of class 2 are increased to 35 clerks of class 2. In line 10, 43 clerks of class 1 are increased to 53 clerks of class 1. That seems to be, so far as I have been able to follow the reading of the bill, characteristic of the entire legislation.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator will permit me, I am sure I can set his mind at rest about that. If he will turn over to page 34, he will find stricken out of the bill the \$30,000 lump sum which had been provided for clerks. I will say to him, furthermore, that we found that the State Department was employing 93 clerks and paying them out of the appropriation of \$2,750,000 made to meet war conditions in Europe. We have made these places statutory positions so far as they were preserved. The number is reduced, and they are made statutory positions. That makes it appear that we are making a large increase in the State Department, whereas, as a matter of fact, we are reducing the clerical force in the State Department.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator stated a moment ago, as I understood him, that the appropriation for the clerical force was increased.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. No; I said I did not know about the aggregate. I said the clerks are increased in some places and diminished in others. I have not made up a statement of the entire amount paid for clerical help; but I know that in the State Department we have reduced the clerical force, and the reason why they appear as increases on the face of the bill is that we have taken the payment from a lump sum and made them statutory provisions, but in a reduced number.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am only asking for information. I am not speaking in any contentious spirit or on account of any fractious disposition in regard to it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I understand the Senator, and we are glad to give him the information.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I call attention to the fact that this item of \$30,000, which the Senator from Virginia says is stricken out of the House bill, was merely a provision for emergency clerical services. It seems that the Senate committee has substituted permanent employment for what was only a contingency, provided against an emergency, in the House bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that the appropriation of \$2,750,000 was for emergency clerks and assistants in foreign lands, the necessity for which was brought about by reason of the war. So far, of that \$2,750,000 the State Department has spent \$2,021,000, leaving a balance of \$729,000 in the fund. The Committee on Appropriations thought that was a very loose way, indeed, of handling the money. We have no report as to what it was expended for. We can not tell how much of that money is to be returned after peace is established by these foreign countries. But the abuse that has existed in the past, where lump sums have been appropriated, every Senator knows should be obviated in the future; and I will say to the Senator that it was for that reason that the number of clerks

provided in the bill was given to the State Department. It is not the full number of 92 clerks that they have now, called emergency clerks, but there are some forty-odd that are put in here that will be permanent, because of the fact that the State Department claim that with the immense amount of work that is piled upon them on account of the war conditions they are compelled to have these forty-odd clerks. Those we gave them as statutory positions, but we struck out the \$30,000 that the House had put in there for emergency clerical services.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I should just like to remark, if the Senator will allow me, at this time that, judging from general conditions, the need for additional clerks seems to arise in many of the departments from the fact that many of the clerks are superannuated. I have long been of the opinion, and am of the opinion now, that as a matter of economy—placing it, if you choose, solely upon the proposition of economy and efficiency, to say nothing of justice—the country could well afford to establish a civil-service pension list, so as to retire clerks at a certain age, and not have the rolls filled with those whom we do not like to discharge and yet who are not capable of performing their duties.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true, Mr. President, in some of the departments; and I hope to see reported to the Senate at this session a bill for the very purpose of granting age pensions to all of the employees of our Government.

Mr. President, I simply can not resist at this time congratulating my Democratic friends upon acknowledging their error some years ago when we Republicans, led by Senator Root, tried to put into this bill the wording that we find now on page 32, as follows:

Undersecretary of State, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say to the Senator that that amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I know it has been agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I thought the Senator wanted to discuss it.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply wanted to congratulate my Democratic friends, because when we had that proposal before the Senate heretofore there were hours and hours of time taken up to show that such a thing was unreasonable and that we were aping foreign nations.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, in line 17, after the word "each," where it occurs the second time, to insert "one at \$2,500"; in line 23, after the word "each," to insert "one at \$2,500"; in line 25, after "\$2,500," to insert "two law clerks, at \$2,250 each; law clerk, \$2,000"; on page 33, line 8, before the words "of class four," to strike out "seventeen" and insert "twenty-five"; in line 9, before the words "of class three," to strike out "nineteen" and insert "twenty-six"; in line 10, before the words "of class two," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "thirty-five"; in the same line, before the words "of class one," to strike out "forty-three" and insert "fifty-three"; in line 13, before the word "messengers," to strike out "six" and insert "seven"; in the same line, before the words "assistant messengers," to strike out "twenty-three" and insert "twenty-five"; in line 15, before the word "laborers," to strike out "four" and insert "seven"; in line 16, after the word "operator," to insert "five female laborers, at \$240 each"; and in line 17, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$321,020" and insert "\$393,900," so as to read:

One at \$2,500, to be appointed by the Secretary, any one of whom may be employed as chief of division of far eastern, Latin American, near eastern, or European affairs, or upon other work in connection with foreign relations; assistant solicitors of the department, to be appointed by the Secretary—3 at \$3,000 each, 1 at \$2,500; chief clerk, who shall sign such official papers and documents as the Secretary may direct, \$3,000; law clerk, \$2,500; 2 law clerks, at \$2,250 each; law clerk, \$2,000; law clerk and assistant, to be selected and appointed by the Secretary, to edit the laws of Congress and perform such other duties as may be required of them, at \$2,500 and \$1,500, respectively; chiefs of bureaus—2 at \$2,250 each, 5 at \$2,100 each; 2 translators, at \$2,100 each; additional to Chief of Bureau of Accounts as disbursing clerk, \$200; private secretary to the Secretary, \$2,500; clerk to the Secretary, \$1,800; clerks—25 of class 4, 26 of class 3, 35 of class 2, 53 of class 1 (3 of whom shall be telegraph operators), 18 at \$1,000 each, 18 at \$900 each; chief messenger, \$1,000; 7 messengers; 25 assistant messengers; messenger boy, \$420; packer, \$720; 7 laborers, at \$600 each; telephone switchboard operator; assistant telephone switchboard operator; 5 female laborers, at \$240 each; driver, \$840; holster, \$720; in all, \$393,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I note an error in spelling on line 17. It ought to be "hostler." It is "holster." It is just an error in spelling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the correction will be made by the clerks.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 34, to strike out:

For emergency clerical services, to be expended by the Secretary of State in his discretion, \$30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 6, after the word "repairs," to strike out "\$10,500" and insert "\$12,500," so as to make the clause read:

Contingent expenses: For stationery, furniture, fixtures, typewriters, including exchange of the same, repairs, and material for repairs, \$12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 16, after the word "foregoing," to strike out "\$7,280" and insert "\$10,000," so as to make the clause read:

For miscellaneous expenses, including purchase, care, and subsistence of horses, to be used only for official purposes, repair and maintenance of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; automobile mail wagon, including exchange of same, harness, equipment for drivers, street-car tickets not exceeding \$100, and other items not included in the foregoing, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 18, after the words "District of Columbia," to strike out "\$11,200" and insert "\$19,080," so as to make the clause read:

For rent of buildings in the District of Columbia, \$19,080.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Treasury Department," on page 37, line 6, after the words "Chief of division," to strike out "\$4,000" and insert "\$4,800," and, in line 17, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$70,750" and insert "\$71,550," so as to make the clause read:

Division of Customs: Chief of division, \$4,800; assistant chiefs of division—1, \$3,000 (in lieu of supervising agent at \$4,500 paid from appropriation "Expenses of collecting revenue from customs"), 1, \$3,000; supervising tea examiner, \$2,750; law clerks—4 at \$2,500 each, 3 at \$2,000 each; clerks—5 of class 4, 4 of class 3 (1 transferred from Division of Special Agents), 6 of class 2 (1 transferred from Division of Special Agents), 9 of class 1 (1 transferred from Division of Special Agents), 5 at \$1,000 each; 2 messengers (1 transferred from Division of Special Agents); assistant messenger; in all, \$71,550.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 23, after the words "lock shop," to strike out "\$1,100" and insert "\$1,200"; in line 25, before the word "at," where it occurs the first time, to strike out "three" and insert "one at \$600, two"; and, on page 40, line 2, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$220,800" and insert "\$221,020," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Supervising Architect: Supervising Architect, \$5,000; executive officer, \$3,250; technical officer, \$3,000; drafting division—superintendent \$3,000, assistant superintendent \$2,750; mechanical engineering division—superintendent \$2,750, assistant superintendent \$2,400; structural division—superintendent \$2,750, assistant superintendent \$2,400; superintendents—computing division \$2,750, repairs division \$2,400, accounts division \$2,500, maintenance division \$2,500; files and records division—chief \$2,500, assistant chief \$2,250; head draftsman, \$2,500; administrative clerks—8 at \$2,000 each; technical clerks—4 at \$1,800 each; clerks—9 of class 4, additional to one of class 4 as bookkeeper \$100, 4 at \$1,700 each, 14 of class 3, 6 at \$1,500 each, 13 of class 2, 8 at \$1,300 each, 21 of class 1, 4 at \$1,100 each, 7 at \$1,000 each, 3 at \$900 each, 2 at \$840 each; photographer, \$2,000; foreman, duplicating galley, \$1,800; 2 duplicating paper chemists at \$1,200 each; foreman vault, safe, and lock shop, \$1,200; 5 messengers; 2 assistant messengers; messenger boys—1 at \$600, 2 at \$480 each, 2 at \$360 each; skilled laborers—4 at \$1,000 each, 7 at \$960 each, 1 \$900, 1 \$840; laborers—1 \$660, 1 \$600; in all, \$221,020.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 12, to insert:

For law books, including their exchange, to be expended under the direction of the Comptroller of the Treasury, \$250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 5, before the words "at \$1,000 each," to strike out "eight" and insert "nine," and, in line 7, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$290,010" and insert "\$291,010," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Auditor for War Department: Auditor, \$4,000; assistant and chief clerk, \$2,250; law clerk, \$2,000; chief of division of accounts, \$2,500; chief of claims and records division, \$2,000; 2 assistant chiefs of division, at \$1,900 each; chief transportation clerk, \$2,000; clerks—22 of class 4, 49 of class 3, 55 of class 2, 45 of class 1, 9 at \$1,000 each; 3 at \$900 each; skilled laborer, \$900; messenger; 5 assistant messengers; 9 laborers; messenger boy, \$480; in all, \$291,010.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 13, after the word "each," where it occurs the second time, to insert "helper, \$900 (transferred from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing)," and, in line 15, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$141,390" and insert "\$142,290," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Auditor for Navy Department: Auditor, \$4,000; chief clerk and chief of division, \$2,250; law clerk, \$2,000; chief of division, \$2,000; assistant chief of division, \$2,000; clerks—13 of class 4, 22 of class 3, 20 of class 2, 23 of class 1, 6 at \$1,000 each, 6 at \$900

each; helper, \$900 (transferred from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing); messenger; assistant messenger; three laborers; in all, \$142,290.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 20, before the words "of class 4," to strike out "13" and insert "16"; in the same line, before the words "of class 3," to strike out "15" and insert "18"; and, in line 24, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$134,430" and insert "\$144,630," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Auditor for Interior Department: Auditor, \$4,000; chief clerk and chief of division, \$2,250; law clerk, \$2,000; chief of division, \$2,000; clerks—16 of class 4, 18 of class 3, 17 of class 2, 22 of class 1, 12 at \$1,000 each, 12 at \$900 each (7 transferred from lump-sum appropriation); 2 messengers; 2 assistant messengers; laborer; in all, \$144,630.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 18, to insert:

For the employment of clerical help in the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue at rates to be fixed by the commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 4, after the words "captain of," to strike out "watch" and insert "guards"; in line 5, after the words "lieutenants of," to strike out "watch" and insert "guards"; and, in line 6, after the word "sixty," to strike out "watchmen" and insert "guards," so as to read:

Bureau of Engraving and Printing: Director, \$6,000; assistant director, \$3,500; chief of division of assignments and reviews, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; disbursing agent, \$2,400; medical and sanitary officer, \$2,000; stenographer, \$1,800; storekeeper, \$1,600; assistant storekeeper, \$1,000; clerk in charge of purchases and supplies, \$2,000; clerks—1 of class 4, 6 of class 3, 9 of class 2, 9 of class 1, 8 at \$1,000 each, 12 at \$900 each, 15 at \$840 each, 3 at \$780 each; 9 attendants, at \$600 each; helpers—1 at \$900, 2 at \$720 each, 2 at \$600 each; 3 messengers; 7 assistant messengers; captain of guards, \$1,400; 2 lieutenants of guards, at \$900 each; 60 guards, at \$720 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 14, after the words "District of Columbia," to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$15,000," so as to make the clause read:

For investigation and experimentation and to secure better methods of administration, with a view to increased efficiency or to greater economy in the expenditure of public money, including necessary traveling expenses, in connection with special work, or obtaining of better administrative methods in any branch of the service within or under the Treasury Department, including the temporary employment of agents, stenographers, accountants, or other expert services, either within or without the District of Columbia, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 53, after line 5, to strike out:

Hereafter no moneys appropriated by this or any other act shall be used for the payment of gas furnished for use in any of the public buildings of the United States in the District of Columbia at a rate in excess of 70 cents per 1,000 cubic feet.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the subhead "Collecting internal revenue," on page 57, after line 4, to insert:

All internal-revenue agents, inspectors, and the cotton-futures attorney may be granted leave of absence with pay, which shall not be cumulative, not to exceed 30 days in any calendar year, under such regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 57, line 21, after the date "1914," to strike out "\$1,600,000" and insert "\$1,750,000," and authority is hereby given to use \$90,000 of said sum for the employment in the District of Columbia of necessary clerical and other personal services and the purchase of such supplies, equipment, mechanical devices, and other articles as may be necessary for use in the District of Columbia," so as to make the clause read:

Collecting the income tax: For expenses of assessing and collecting the income tax as provided in paragraph N, section 2, of an act entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties, and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1913, including the purchase of such supplies, equipment, mechanical devices, and other articles as may be necessary for use in the several collection districts, including not to exceed \$4 per diem, in lieu of subsistence, pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, \$1,750,000, and authority is hereby given to use \$90,000 of said sum for the employment in the District of Columbia of necessary clerical and other personal services and the purchase of such supplies, equipment, mechanical devices, and other articles as may be necessary for use in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 59, after line 21, to insert:

When absent on duty from their customary residence, all internal-revenue agents appointed under section 3152, Revised Statutes, as amended, and cotton-futures attorneys may be granted per diem in lieu of subsistence not exceeding \$4, and, when absent on duty from their customary residence, income-tax agents and inspectors, special gaugers, and special employees may be granted a per diem in lieu

of subsistence not exceeding \$3, the per diem in lieu of subsistence to be fixed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will call the attention of Senators to the fact that on page 57, line 6, the bill says "the cotton-futures attorney," while on the page just read it is the plural.

Mr. OVERMAN. There is only one, but I suppose we had better leave it that way.

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; there is only one in one case, but there is more than one in the other case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well; that explains it.

Mr. SMOOT. But, Mr. President, there is a question in my mind as to the advisability of this amendment. I do not want to go into the discussion of it to-day, however. I will content myself by allowing it to go into conference, and having it thoroughly discussed in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Mints and assay offices," on page 64, line 16, after the word "employees," to strike out "\$90,000" and insert "\$92,000," so as to make the clause read:

For wages of workmen and other employees, \$92,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Assay office at Deadwood, S. Dak.," on page 66, line 20, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$500" and insert "\$1,500," so as to make the clause read:

For incidental and contingent expenses, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "War Department," on page 68, line 13, before the words "of class 2," to strike out "14" and insert "15"; in line 14, after the word "each," to insert "one at \$900"; in line 17, after the word "messengers," to insert "two assistant messengers, at \$600 each"; and in line 22, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$143,540" and insert "\$147,040," so as to make the clause read:

Office of the Secretary: Secretary of War, \$12,000; Assistant Secretary, \$5,000; assistant and chief clerk, who shall sign such official papers and documents as the Secretary may direct, \$4,000; private secretary to the Secretary, \$2,500; clerk to the Secretary, \$2,000; stenographer to the Secretary, \$2,000; clerk to the Assistant Secretary, \$2,400; assistant chief clerk, \$2,400; disbursing clerk, \$2,750; appointment clerk, \$2,250; four chiefs of divisions, at \$2,000 each; superintendent of buildings outside of State, War, and Navy Department Building, in addition to compensation as chief of division, \$500; chief telegrapher, \$1,800; clerks—5 of class 4, 5 of class 3, 15 of class 2, 19 of class 1, 5 at \$1,000 each, 1 at \$900; foreman, \$1,200; carpenters—one \$1,200, one \$1,080; chief messenger, \$1,000; skilled laborer, \$1,080; six messengers; seven assistant messengers; two assistant messengers, at \$600 each; telephone switchboard operator; assistant telephone switchboard operator; engineer, \$900; assistant engineer, \$720; fireman; four watchmen; three watchmen, at \$660 each; eight laborers; hostlers—one \$600, one \$540; four charwomen; in all, \$147,040.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 17, after the words "chief clerk," to strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$2,200," and in line 20, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$24,800" and insert "\$25,000," so as to make the clause read:

Signal Office: Chief clerk, \$2,200; clerks—2 of class 4, 1 of class 3, 1 of class 2, 4 of class 1, 9 at \$1,000 each; two messengers; assistant messenger; in all, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 20, after the word "each," to insert "3 at \$2,000 each"; in line 21, after the word "clerks," to strike out "15" and insert "12"; and on page 71, line 5, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$372,320" and insert "\$372,920," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Quartermaster General: Chief clerk, \$2,750; principal clerks—5 at \$2,250 each, 3 at \$2,000 each; clerks—12 of class 4, 25 of class 3, 44 of class 2, 85 of class 1, 50 at \$1,000 each, 10 at \$900 each; advisory architect, \$4,000; draftsmen—three at \$1,800 each, seven at \$1,600 each, five at \$1,400 each; supervising engineer, \$2,750; hydraulic and sanitary engineer, \$2,000; civil engineer, \$1,800; electrical engineer, \$2,000; electrical and mechanical engineer, \$2,250; marine engineer, \$3,500; sanitary and heating engineer, \$1,800; blue-print operator, \$900; 6 messengers; 14 assistant messengers; 12 laborers; laborers—one \$600, one \$480; in all, \$372,920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, after line 23, to insert:

Section 7 of the general deficiency appropriation act approved August 26, 1912, as amended by section 4 of the act making appropriations for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government, approved March 4, 1913, restricting changes in salaries of certain employees paid from lump-sum appropriations, is further amended to provide that it shall not apply to draftsmen whose services are necessary in carrying on the various manufacturing or constructing operations of the Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 4, after the word "messenger," to strike out "assistant messenger" and insert "two assistant messengers," and in line 5, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$38,480" and insert "\$39,200," so as to make the clause read:

Division of Militia Affairs, Office of Chief of Staff: For the following authorized by section 20 of the act approved January 21, 1903, as amended by the act approved May 27, 1908, and as restricted by the legislative, executive, and judicial act approved March 4, 1915: Chief clerk, \$2,000; clerks—2 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 4 of class 2, 11 of class 1, 8 at \$1,000 each; messenger; 2 assistant messengers; 2 laborers; in all, \$39,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 11, after the word "offices," to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$25,000," so as to make the clause read:

For stationery for the department and its bureaus and offices, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Public buildings and grounds," on page 75, line 23, after the words "landscape architect," to insert "and the purchase of park designs," so as to make the clause read:

Office of public buildings and grounds: Superintendent, \$3,000; assistant and chief clerk, \$2,400; clerks—1 of class 4, 1 of class 3, 1 of class 2 and stenographer, 1 of class 1; messenger; landscape architect and the purchase of park designs, \$2,400; surveyor and draftsman, \$1,500; in all, \$16,140.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 3, after the word "park," to strike out "watchmen" and insert "police," so as to make the clause read:

For sergeant of park police, \$950.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, after line 3, to strike out "For second sergeant of park watchmen, \$900" and insert "For two second sergeants of park police, at \$900 each, \$1,800," so as to make the clause read:

For two second sergeants of park police, at \$900 each, \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 6, after the word "day," to strike out "watchmen" and insert "police"; in line 21, before the words "in Potomac Park," to strike out "three" and insert "four"; in line 22, before the words "in all," to strike out "twenty-two" and insert "twenty-three"; and in the same line, after the word "each," to strike out "\$18,480" and insert "\$19,320," so as to make the clause read:

For day police, as follows: One in Franklin Park and adjacent reservations on New York Avenue; 1 in Lafayette Park; 2 in Smithsonian Grounds and neighboring reservations; 1 in Judiciary Park; 1 in Lincoln Park and adjacent reservations; 1 in Iowa Circle and reservations to the northeast; 1 in Thomas and Scott Circles and neighboring reservations; 1 in Washington Circle and neighboring reservations; 1 in Dupont Circle and neighboring reservations; 1 in McPherson Park and Farragut Square; 1 in Stanton Park and neighboring reservations; 2 in Henry and Seaton Parks and neighboring reservations; 1 in Mount Vernon Park and reservations to the northeast; 1 in grounds south of the Executive Mansion; 1 in Garfield and Marion Parks and reservations to the east; 1 in Monument Park; 4 in Potomac Park; 1 in Montrose Park; 23 in all, at \$840 each, \$19,320.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 23, after the word "night," to strike out "watchmen" and insert "police"; in the same line, before the word "in," to strike out "Two" and insert "Three"; on page 77, line 5, before the words "in Lafayette," to strike out "one" and insert "two"; in line 10, before the words "in all," to strike out "nineteen" and insert "twenty-one"; and in the same line, after the word "each," to strike out "\$15,960" and insert "\$17,640," so as to make the clause read:

For night police, as follows: Three in Smithsonian Grounds and neighboring reservations; 1 in Judiciary Park; 2 in Henry and Seaton Parks and adjacent reservations; 1 in grounds south of the Executive Mansion; 1 in Monument Park; 1 in Garfield Park and neighboring reservations; 1 in Iowa, Scott, and Thomas Circles and neighboring reservations; 1 in Stanton and Lincoln Parks and neighboring reservations; 2 in Lafayette, McPherson, Franklin, and Farragut Parks; 1 in Washington and Dupont Circles and neighboring reservations; 1 in Mount Vernon Park and neighboring reservations; 2 for greenhouses and nursery; 4 in Potomac Park; 21 in all, at \$840 each, \$17,640.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 18, after the word "park," to strike out "watchmen" and insert "police," so as to make the clause read:

For purchase and repair of bicycles and revolvers for park police and for purchase of ammunition, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, after line 19, to strike out:

For purchase of one motor cycle \$250, and for the upkeep of the same, \$240; in all, \$490.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, after line 21, to insert:

For purchase of two motor cycles at \$250 each, and for the upkeep of same at \$240 each, \$980.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 25, after the word "bridge," to strike out "watchmen" and insert "police," so as to make the clause read:

For purchasing and supplying uniforms to park, Monument, and bridge police, \$2,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 2, after the words "sum of," to strike out "\$35,890" and insert "\$37,845," so as to make the clause read:

Of the foregoing amounts appropriated under public buildings and grounds, the sum of \$37,845 shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "State, War, and Navy Department Building," on page 78, line 6, after the words "of class 3," to strike out "stenographer and typewriter, \$900" and insert "clerk of class 1," and in line 18, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$103,560" and insert "\$103,860," so as to make the clause read:

Office of superintendent: Clerk of class 3; clerk of class 1; chief engineer, \$1,400; 5 assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each; electrical machinist, \$1,200; captain of the watch, \$1,200; 2 lieutenants of the watch, at \$840 each; 40 watchmen; carpenter, \$1,000; electrician, \$1,200; machinist, \$1,000; painter, \$1,000; plumber, \$1,000; 3 dynamo tenders, at \$900 each; 7 skilled laborers or mechanics, at \$840 each; messenger; foreman of laborers, \$840; 10 firemen; 11 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 17 laborers; 3 second-class firemen, at \$660 each; 4 forewomen of charwomen, at \$300 each; 67 charwomen; gardener, \$720; in all, \$103,860.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 21, after "\$32,000," to strike out "Provided, That the commission in charge, or a majority of the members thereof, may at any time reapportion space among the departments now occupying the State, War, and Navy Department Building if the same can be done with a reduction of the amount of floor space occupied by any branch of the public service in said building, the reduction or avoidance of public expense for rent of office or storage space for the Government, and the reduction of the number of watchmen required for said building from 40 to not more than 38: *Provided further*, That no arrangement of space made hereunder shall involve the ejection from the building of any department or branch of the public service now occupying the same: *Provided further*, That no rooms vacated under any arrangement of space hereunder shall be used for museum purposes," so as to make the clause read:

For fuel, lights, repairs, miscellaneous items, printing, and city directories, \$32,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Navy Department," on page 79, line 22, after the word "Secretary" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$2,750"; in line 23, after "\$2,250," to insert "private secretary to Assistant Secretary, \$2,400"; on page 80, line 1, after the word "clerks," to strike out "two" and insert "one"; in line 4, after the word "carpenter," to strike out "\$900" and insert "\$1,000"; and in line 7, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$81,140" and insert "\$82,090," so as to make the clause read:

Office of the Secretary: Secretary of the Navy, \$12,000; Assistant Secretary, \$5,000; chief clerk \$3,000; private secretary to Secretary, \$2,750; clerk to Secretary, \$2,250; private secretary to Assistant Secretary, \$2,400; clerk to Assistant Secretary, \$2,000; disbursing clerk, \$2,250; appointment clerk, \$2,000; estimate clerk, \$1,800; stenographer, \$1,800; clerks—1 of class 4, 3 of class 3, 5 of class 2, 5 of class 1, 1 \$1,100, 6 at \$1,000 each; stenographer, \$1,200; 3 copyists; carpenter, \$1,000; 4 messengers; 4 assistant messengers; 3 laborers; messenger boys—4 at \$600 each, 1 \$420, 1 \$400, 1 \$360; 2 telephone switchboard operators; in all, \$82,090.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, line 7, after the word "clerks," to strike out "1 at \$2,000" and insert "2 at \$2,000 each," and, in line 12, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$82,050" and insert "\$84,050," so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Navigation: Chief clerk, \$2,250; clerks—2 at \$2,000 each, 5 of class 4, 5 of class 3, 6 of class 2, 8 of class 1, 3 at \$1,100 each, 14 at \$1,000 each; 14 copyists; 9 copyists at \$840 each; 2 assistant messengers; messenger boy, \$600; 5 laborers; in all \$84,050.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, line 13, after the word "Clerks," to strike out "1 of class 4" and insert "2 of class 4," and in line 16, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$12,300" and insert "\$14,100," so as to make the clause read:

Office of Naval Intelligence: Clerks—2 of class 4, 1 of class 3, 1 \$1,300, 3 at \$1,000 each; 2 translators, at \$1,400 each; draftsman, \$1,200; messenger boy, \$600; in all \$14,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, line 3, after the word "repair," to insert "exchange," so as to make the clause read:

For fuel, oil, grease, pipe, wire, and other materials needed for the maintenance and repair of boilers, engines, heating apparatus, electric lighting and power plant, and water-supply system; purchase and maintenance of teams; maintenance, repair, exchange, or operation of motor truck and of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; material for boxing nautical instruments for transportation; paints, telegraph, and telephone service, and incidental labor, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for Bureau of Steam Engineering, on page 85, line 23, before the words "of class 1," to strike out "5" and insert "6"; in line 24, after the word "copyist," to insert "2 expert radio aids, at \$3,130 each"; on page 86, line 3, after the word "laborers," to insert "1 at \$720"; in the same line, after "\$720," to strike out "3" and insert "2"; and, in line 5, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$46,890" and insert "\$54,410," so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Steam Engineering: Chief clerk, \$2,250; bookkeeper and accountant, \$1,800; clerks—1 of class 4, 4 of class 3, 4 of class 2, 2 at \$1,300 each, 6 of class 1, 1 \$1,100, 4 at \$1,000 each, 1 \$900; copyist; 2 expert radio aids, at \$3,130 each; expert in wireless telegraphy, \$3,000; draftsman—1 (who shall be an expert in marine construction) \$2,000, 1 \$1,400, assistant \$1,200; blue printer, \$720; 2 assistant messengers; laborers—1 at \$720, 2 at \$660 each; 2 at \$600 each; messenger boy, \$600; in all, \$54,410.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 21, before the words "of class 1," to strike out "three" and insert "four"; in line 22, after the words "at \$1,100 each," to strike out "nine" and insert "ten"; and in line 24, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$60,950" and insert "\$63,250," so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Construction and Repair: Chief clerk, \$2,250; clerks—2 of class 4, 3 of class 3, 3 of class 2, 4 at \$1,300 each, 4 of class 1, 10 at \$1,100 each, 15 at \$1,000 each; 5 copyists; two assistant messengers; laborer; messenger boys—9 at \$600 each; 1 \$400; in all, \$63,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 15, after the word "clerks," to strike out "1 of class 4" and insert "2 of class 4," and in line 19, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$30,210" and insert "\$32,010," so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Ordnance: Chief clerk, \$2,250; draftsman, \$1,400; clerks—2 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 2 of class 2, 1 \$1,300, 3 of class 1, 1 \$1,100, 5 at \$1,000 each; 3 copyists; 2 copyists, at \$840 each; assistant messenger; messenger boys—2 at \$600 each, 2 at \$400 each; laborer; in all, \$32,010.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 12, after the word "clerks," to strike out "four" and insert "five"; in line 13, before the words "of class 2," to strike out "seven" and insert "eight"; in line 14, before "at \$1,100," to strike out "ten" and insert "twelve"; in line 16, after the word "boys," to strike out "three" and insert "four"; in line 17, before the words "at \$400," to strike out "three" and insert "two"; and in the same line, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$118,890" and insert "\$124,490," so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Supplies and Accounts: Civilian assistant, \$2,500; chief accountant, \$2,250; 2 chief bookkeepers, at \$2,000 each; statistician, \$1,800; clerks—5 of class 4, 8 of class 3, 8 of class 2, 15 of class 1, 12 at \$1,100 each, 28 at \$1,000 each, 14 at \$900 each; 2 copyists, at \$840 each; 5 assistant messengers; messenger boys—4 at \$600 each; 2 at \$400 each; laborer; in all, \$124,490.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, line 22, before the words "at \$1,000," to strike out "three" and insert "four," and in line 23, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$10,100" and insert "\$11,100," so as to make the clause read:

Division of Naval Militia Affairs: For the following, authorized by section 17 of the Naval Militia act approved February 16, 1914: Chief clerk, \$1,600; clerks—1 of class 2, 2 of class 1, 1 \$1,100, 4 at \$1,000 each; messenger boys—1 \$600; in all, \$11,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 1, after the word "binding," to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$3,600," so as to make the clause read:

For miscellaneous expenses, including stationery, furniture, office equipment, postage, typewriters and exchange of same, and necessary printing and binding \$3,600, which sum, together with the foregoing amount for salaries, shall be paid from the appropriation for "Arming and equipping Naval Militia" for the fiscal year 1917, and no other or

further sums shall be expended from said appropriation for or on account of said Division of Naval Militia Affairs during the fiscal year 1917.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 17, after the word "vehicles," to insert "automobile mail wagon, including exchange of same," and, in line 21, after the word "offices," to strike out "\$42,000" and insert "\$45,000," so as to make the clause read:

For stationery, furniture, newspapers, plans, drawings, drawing materials, horses and wagons to be used only for official purposes, including rental of stable; purchase, maintenance, repair, or operation of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, automobile mail wagon, including exchange of same, street car tickets not exceeding \$250, freight, expressage, postage, typewriters and computing machines and exchange of same, and other absolutely necessary expenses of the Navy Department and its various bureaus and offices, \$45,000; it shall not be lawful to expend, for any of the offices or bureaus of the Navy Department at Washington, any sum out of appropriations made for the Naval Establishment for any of the purposes mentioned or authorized in this paragraph.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of the Interior," on page 91, line 20, after "\$2,500," to strike out: "Two special inspectors, whose employment shall be limited to the inspection of offices and the work in the several offices under the control of the department, at \$2,500 each," so as to read:

Office of the Secretary: Secretary of the Interior, \$12,000; First Assistant Secretary, \$5,000; Assistant Secretary, \$4,500; chief clerk, including \$500 as superintendent of buildings, who shall be chief executive officer of the department and who may be designated by the Secretary to sign official papers and documents during the temporary absence of the Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries, \$4,000; assistant to the Secretary, \$2,750; assistant attorney, \$2,500.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, from information I have received, I think the committee acted on that amendment and struck it out upon misinformation.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think myself, Mr. President, that it would be well if the committee amendment were rejected in that case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, in the item for the maintenance of the office of the Secretary of the Interior, on page 92, line 21, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$275,820" and insert "\$270,820," so as to read:

Engineer, \$1,200; assistant engineer, \$1,000; 7 firemen; clerk to sign, under the direction of the Secretary, in his name and for him; his approval of all tribal deeds to allottees and deeds for town lots made and executed according to law for any of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in the Indian Territory, \$1,200; in all, \$270,820.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That amendment is a mere matter of total, but the amendment just rejected necessitates the rejection of this also. I ask unanimous consent that the clerks may readjust the totals if any mistake is made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that order will be made. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 94, line 13, after the word "clerks," to strike out "twenty-seven" and insert "twenty-nine"; in line 14, before the words "of class 3," to strike out "fifty-one" and insert "fifty-two"; in line 15, before the words "of class 2," to strike out "seventy-four" and insert "seventy-seven"; in line 16, before the words "of class 1," to strike out "seventy-seven" and insert "eighty-two"; in the same line, before the words "at \$1,000," to strike out "sixty-five" and insert "sixty-six"; in line 17, before the word "copyists," where it occurs the first time, to strike out "sixty-five" and insert "seventy-one"; in the same line, before the word "copyists," where it occurs the second time, to strike "twenty-six" and insert "twenty-nine"; and, on page 95, line 2, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$631,250" and insert "\$655,210," so as to make the clause read:

General Land Office: Commissioner, \$5,000; assistant commissioner, \$3,500; chief clerk, \$3,000; chief law clerk, \$2,500; 2 law clerks, at \$2,200 each; 3 law examiners of surveyors general and district land offices, at \$2,000 each; recorder, \$2,000; chiefs of divisions—one of surveys \$2,750, one \$2,400, ten at \$2,000 each; assistant chief of division, \$2,000; law examiners—13 at \$2,000 each, 10 at \$1,800 each, 18 at \$1,600 each; clerks 29 of class 4, 52 of class 3, 77 of class 2, 82 of class 1, 66 at \$1,000 each; 71 copyists; 29 copyists, at \$720 each; 2 messengers; 10 assistant messengers; messenger boys—10 at \$600 each, 6 at \$480 each; 6 skilled laborers, who may act as assistant messengers when required, at \$600 each; 16 laborers; laborer, \$480; packer, \$720; depositary acting for the commissioner as receiver of public moneys, \$2,000, who may, with the approval of the commissioner, designate a clerk of the General Land Office to act as such depositary in his absence; clerk and librarian, \$1,000; in all, \$655,210.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 95, line 14, after the words "General Land Office," to strike out "\$6,000" and insert "\$8,000," so as to make the clause read:

For per diem in lieu of subsistence, at not exceeding \$4, pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, of examiners and of clerks detailed to inspect offices of United States surveyors general and other offices in public-land service, to investigate fraudulent land entries, trespasses on the public lands, and cases of official misconduct, actual necessary expenses of transportation, including necessary sleeping-car fares, and for employment of stenographers and other assistants when necessary to the efficient conduct of examinations, and when authorized by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 96, after line 2, to strike out:

For separate State and Territorial maps of public-land States, including maps showing areas designated by the Secretary of the Interior under the enlarged homestead acts prepared in the General Land Office, \$3,000.

And to insert:

For maps showing areas designated by the Secretary of the Interior under the enlarged homestead acts, prepared in the General Land Office, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 97, after line 20, to strike out:

Appointments shall not be made to any of the positions herein appropriated for in the classified service of the Bureau of Pensions not actually filled June 30, 1916, nor shall more than 25 per cent of other vacancies actually occurring in any grade in the classified service of that bureau during the fiscal year 1917 be filled by original appointment or promotion. The salaries or compensation of all places which may not be filled as hereinabove provided for shall not be available for expenditure, but shall lapse and shall be covered into the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 98, line 22, after the word "each," to strike out "examiner of interferences, \$2,700" and insert "two examiners of interferences, at \$2,700 each"; in line 25, after "\$2,400," to insert "two second assistants, at \$2,100 each"; and on page 99, line 19, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$1,375,040" and insert "\$1,381,940," so as to make the clause read:

Patent Office: Commissioner, \$5,000; first assistant commissioner, \$4,500; assistant commissioner, \$3,500; chief clerk (who shall be qualified to act as principal examiner), \$3,000; 5 law examiners, at \$2,750 each; examiner of classification, \$3,600; 5 examiners in chief, at \$3,500 each; 2 examiners of interferences, at \$2,700 each; examiners of trademarks and designs—1 \$2,700, first assistant \$2,400, 2 second assistants at \$2,100 each, 6 assistants at \$1,500 each; examiners—43 principals at \$2,700 each, 86 first assistants at \$2,400 each, 86 second assistants at \$2,100 each, 86 third assistants at \$1,800 each, 86 fourth assistants at \$1,500 each; financial clerk, who shall give bonds in such amount as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, \$2,250; librarian, who shall be qualified to act as an assistant examiner, \$2,000; 6 chiefs of divisions, at \$2,000 each; 3 assistant chiefs of divisions, at \$1,800 each; private secretary, to be selected and appointed by the commissioner, \$1,800; translator of languages, \$1,800; clerks—9 of class 4, 9 of class 3, 17 of class 2, 130 of class 1, 91 at \$1,000 each; 3 skilled draftsmen, at \$1,200 each; 4 draftsmen, at \$1,000 each; 90 copyists; 50 copyists, at \$720 each; 4 messengers; 25 assistant messengers; laborers—14 at \$600 each, 42 at \$540 each; 40 messenger boys, at \$420 each; in all, \$1,381,940.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 99, after line 19, to insert:

For special and temporary services of typewriters certified by the Civil Service Commission, who may be employed in such numbers at \$2.50 per diem as may, in the judgment of the Commissioner of Patents, be necessary to keep current the work of furnishing manuscript copies of records, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 100, line 6, after the word "papers," to strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$140,000," so as to make the clause read:

For producing copies of weekly issue of patents, designs, and trademarks; production of copies of drawings and specifications of exhausted patents and other papers, \$140,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Offices of Surveyors General," on page 106, line 5, after the word "Clerks," to strike out "\$16,000" and insert "\$17,240," so as to make the clause read:

Clerks, \$17,240.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 106, line 6, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$21,240," so as to make the clause read:

Contingent expenses, \$1,000; in all, \$21,240.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, after line 2, to strike out:

The use of the fund created by the act of July 2, 1864 (13 Stat., p. 365), and the act of March 2, 1895 (28 Stat., p. 937), for office work in the surveyor generals' office and in the General Land Office is ex-

tended for one year from June 30, 1916: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$25,000 of this fund shall be used for the purposes above indicated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Post Office Department," in the item of appropriation for the maintenance of the Office of the Postmaster General, on page 110, line 2, before the word "dynamo," to strike out "three" and insert "two"; in the same line, after the word "each," to insert "(one omitted)"; and in line 11, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$191,450" and insert "\$190,550," so as to read:

Electrician, \$1,400; 2 assistant electricians, at \$1,200 each; 2 dynamo tenders, at \$900 each (1 omitted); fireman, who shall be a blacksmith, and fireman, who shall be a steam fitter, at \$900 each; 10 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 15 firemen; carpenters—one \$1,200, one \$1,000, two at \$900 each; captain of the watch, \$1,000; additional to 2 watchmen acting as lieutenant of watchmen, at \$120 each; 22 watchmen; foreman of laborers, \$800; 43 laborers; plumber, \$900; awning maker, \$900; female laborers—one \$540, 3 at \$500 each, 5 at \$480 each; 43 charwomen; in all \$190,550.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 111, line 12, after the word "building," to strike out "Three assistant engineers, at \$900 each," and insert "Two assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each"; in line 17, after the words "assistant plumber," to strike out "\$720" and insert "\$840"; and in line 19, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$38,700" and insert "\$38,120," so as to make the clause read:

Washington, D. C., post-office building: Two assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each; 3 assistant electricians, at \$900 each; 10 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 3 officers, at \$720 each; 12 watchmen; additional to 1 watchman acting as lieutenant of watch, \$120; 15 laborers; assistant plumber, \$840; 2 female laborers, at \$480 each; 15 charwomen; in all, \$38,120.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 112, line 10, after the word "clerks," to strike out "17 of class 4 (2 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 2 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office), 23 of class 3 (3 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 1 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, and 1 submitted at \$1,400), 37 of class 2 (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,600, 2 transferred from Postmaster General's office, 4 from Second Assistant's office, 9 from Fourth Assistant's office, and 1 submitted at \$1,200), 50 of class 1 (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,400, 5 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 26 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, 3 submitted at \$1,000 each, and 1 at \$900), 34 at \$1,000 each (3 in lieu of 3 at \$1,200 each, 3 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 16 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, and 3 submitted at \$900 each), 20 at \$900 each (3 in lieu of 3 at \$1,000 each, 1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,200, 1 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 6 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, 2 submitted at \$840 each, and 3 at \$720 each); 4 messengers (2 in lieu of 2 at \$900 each and 1 submitted at \$660); 8 assistant messengers (3 in lieu of 3 at \$900 each, 1 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 2 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office); 7 laborers (1 in lieu of 1 at \$840, 6 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office); 3 female laborers at \$480 each (formerly pages in Fourth Assistant's office); in all, \$278,630," and to insert "16 of class 4 (1 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 2 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office), 24 of class 3 (4 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 1 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, 1 submitted at \$1,400, and 1 submitted at \$1,200), 36 of class 2 (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,600, 2 transferred from Postmaster General's office, 3 from Second Assistant's office, 9 from Fourth Assistant's office, 1 submitted at \$1,200, and 1 transferred to Postmaster General's office), 50 of class 1 (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,600, 1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,400, 5 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 26 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, 4 submitted at \$1,000 each, and 1 at \$900), 36 at \$1,000 each (4 in lieu of 4 at \$1,200 each, 5 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 16 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, and 3 submitted at \$900 each), 19 at \$900 each (3 in lieu of 3 at \$1,000 each, 1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,200, 1 transferred from Division of Postal Savings, 6 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, 2 submitted at \$840 each, and 4 at \$720 each); 4 messengers (2 in lieu of 2 at \$900 each and 1 submitted at \$660); 7 assistant messengers (4 in lieu of 3 at \$900 each, 2 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office); 7 laborers (1 in lieu of 1 at \$840, 6 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office); 3 female laborers at \$480 each (transferred from Fourth Assistant's office); in all, \$277,410," so as to make the clause read:

Office First Assistant Postmaster General: First Assistant Postmaster General, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; Division of Post Office Service—superintendent \$4,000 (formerly Superintendent of Division of Salaries and Allowances), assistant superintendent \$3,000 (formerly Superintendent Division of City Delivery), assistant superintendent \$2,250 (formerly Assistant Superintendent Division of Salaries and Allowances), 2 assistant superintendents \$2,000 each (1 formerly Assistant Superintendent Division of City Delivery, 1 formerly Superintendent

Division of Miscellaneous Transportation, Second Assistant's office); Division of Postmasters' Appointments—superintendent \$3,000, 2 assistant superintendents at \$2,000 each, Superintendent Division of Dead Letters \$2,500 (transferred from Fourth Assistant's office), Chief Division of Correspondence \$2,000; clerks—16 of class 4 (1 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 2 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office), 24 of class 3 (4 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 1 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, 1 submitted at \$1,400, and 1 submitted at \$1,200), 36 of class 2 (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,600, 2 transferred from Postmaster General's office, 3 from Second Assistant's office, 9 from Fourth Assistant's office, 1 submitted at \$1,200, and 1 transferred to Postmaster General's office), 50 of class 1 (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,600, 1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,400, 5 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 26 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, 4 submitted at \$1,000 each, and 1 at \$900), 36 at \$1,000 each (4 in lieu of 4 at \$1,200 each, 5 transferred from Second Assistant's office, 16 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, and 3 submitted at \$900 each), 19 at \$900 each (3 in lieu of 3 at \$1,000 each, 1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,200, 1 transferred from Division of Postal Savings, 6 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office, 2 submitted at \$840 each, and 4 at \$720 each); 4 messengers (2 in lieu of 2 at \$900 each and 1 submitted at \$660); 7 assistant messengers (4 in lieu of 3 at \$900 each, 2 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office); 7 laborers (1 in lieu of 1 at \$840, 6 transferred from Fourth Assistant's office); 3 female laborers at \$480 each (transferred from Fourth Assistant's office); in all, \$277,410.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 114, line 17, after the word "clerks," to strike out "11 of class 4 (2 transferred to First Assistant's office), 19 of class 3 (3 transferred to First Assistant's office and 1 submitted at \$1,200), 10 of class 2 (1 transferred to Postmaster General's office, 4 transferred to First Assistant's office, and 3 submitted at \$1,200), 10 of class 1 (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,600, 3 in lieu of 3 at \$1,400, 1 transferred to Postmaster General's office, 5 transferred to First Assistant's office, 2 submitted at \$1,000 each, and 1 at \$900), 10 at \$1,000 each (2 in lieu of 2 at \$1,200, 3 transferred to First Assistant's office, and 1 submitted at \$900), 8 at \$900 each (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,200, 1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,000, 1 transferred to First Assistant's office); messenger in charge of mails, \$900; 4 assistant messengers (1 in lieu of clerk, \$900, transferred from Division of Railway Mail Service, 1 transferred to First Assistant's offices); page, \$360; in all, \$115,390"; and to insert "11 of class 4 (1 transferred to First Assistant's office, and 1 omitted), 18 of class 3 (4 transferred to First Assistant's office and 1 submitted at \$1,200), 12 of class 2 (1 transferred to Postmaster General's office, 3 transferred to First Assistant's office, and 2 submitted at \$1,200), 8 of class 1 (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,600, 2 in lieu of 2 at \$1,400, 1 transferred to Postmaster General's office, 5 transferred to First Assistant's office, 1 submitted at \$1,000, and 3 omitted), 8 at \$1,000 each (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,200, 5 transferred to First Assistant's office), 7 at \$900 each; messenger in charge of mails, \$900; 4 assistant messengers (1 in lieu of clerk, \$900, transferred from Division of Railway Mail Service, 1 omitted); page, \$360; in all, \$111,190"; so as to make the clause read:

Office Second Assistant Postmaster General: Second Assistant Postmaster General, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; Division of Railway Adjustments—superintendent \$3,000, assistant superintendent \$2,250; Division of Foreign Mails—superintendent \$3,000, assistant superintendent, \$2,000; clerks—11 of class 4 (1 transferred to first assistant's office and 1 omitted), 18 of class 3 (4 transferred to first assistant's office and 1 submitted at \$1,200), 12 of class 2 (1 transferred to Postmaster General's office, 3 transferred to first assistant's office, and 2 submitted at \$1,200), 8 of class 1 (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,600, 2 in lieu of 2 at \$1,400, 1 transferred to Postmaster General's office, 5 transferred to first assistant's office, 1 submitted at \$1,000, and 3 omitted), 8 at \$1,000 each (1 in lieu of 1 at \$1,200, 5 transferred to first assistant's office), 7 at \$900 each; messenger in charge of mails, \$900; 4 assistant messengers (1 in lieu of clerk, \$900, transferred from Division of Railway Mail Service, 1 omitted); page, \$360; in all, \$111,190.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for the maintenance of the office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, on page 119, line 8, before the word "laborers," to strike out "21" and insert "19"; in line 10, before the word "omitted," to strike out "2" and insert "4," and, in the same line, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$311,070" and insert "\$309,750," so as to read:

Eight assistant messengers (1 submitted at \$660, 2 transferred to first assistant's office); 19 laborers (1 in lieu of assistant messenger, 6 transferred to first assistant's office, and 4 omitted); in all, \$309,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 120, line 10, after the word "cabinets," to strike out "\$7,000" and insert "\$12,000," so as to make the clause read:

For furniture and filing cabinets, \$12,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Justice," on page 123, after line 19, to insert:

The Attorney General is authorized to enter into a contract for the lease of a modern fireproof office building for the use of the Department of Justice, for a period not to exceed five years, renewable, at the

option of the Government, for an additional period not exceeding five years, at an annual rental not exceeding \$36,000, and at a rate per annum per square foot of available floor space not to exceed 36.3 cents.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary read the next paragraph of the bill, as follows:

Office of Solicitor of the Treasury: Solicitor, \$5,000; assistant solicitor, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$2,000; 1 law clerk, \$2,000; 2 docket clerks, at \$2,000 each; clerks—2 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 2 of class 2; assistant messenger; laborer; in all, \$26,980.

Mr. KERN. I desire to offer an amendment at that point, and I will present it now if it is in order to do so.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I suggest to the Senator from Indiana to wait until we get through with the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The agreement was that the committee amendments should be first considered, unless the Senator has an amendment to the committee amendment.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Commerce," on page 124, line 25, after the word "clerks," to strike out "nine" and insert "ten"; on page 125, line 7, after the words "assistant engineer," to strike out "\$800" and insert "\$1,000"; and in line 14, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$179,140" and insert "\$181,140," so as to make the clause read:

Office of the Secretary: Secretary of Commerce, \$12,000; Assistant Secretary, \$5,000; private secretary to the Secretary, \$2,500; confidential clerk to the Secretary, \$1,800; private secretary to Assistant Secretary, \$2,100; chief clerk and superintendent, \$3,000; disbursing clerk, \$3,000; chiefs of divisions—appointments, \$2,500, publications, \$2,500, supplies \$2,100; assistant chief, division of publications, \$2,000; clerks—10 of class 4, 9 of class 3, 9 of class 2, 19 of class 1 (4 transferred from Census Office), 11 at \$1,000 each, 11 at \$900 each (1 transferred from Census Office); 2 telephone operators, at \$720 each; messenger to the Secretary, \$1,000; 5 messengers; 7 assistant messengers; 8 messenger boys, at \$480 each (1 transferred from Census Office); engineer, \$1,100; assistant engineer, \$1,000; skilled laborers—1 at \$1,000, 1 at \$900 (transferred from Census Office), 2 at \$840 each, 5 at \$720 each (1 in lieu of 1 watchman at \$720); 3 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 3 firemen; 13 laborers; 2 laborers, at \$480 each; cabinetmaker, \$1,000; carpenter, \$900; chief watchman, \$900; 9 watchmen; 25 charwomen; in all, \$181,140.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 125, line 22, after the word "draftsmen," to strike out "one \$1,800" and insert "two at \$1,800 each," and in line 24, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$64,030" and insert "\$65,830," so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Lighthouses: Commissioner, \$5,000; deputy commissioner, \$4,000; chief constructing engineer, \$4,000; superintendent of naval construction, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$2,400; clerks—1 \$2,000, 2 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 2 of class 2, 5 of class 1, 7 at \$1,000 each, 2 at \$900 each, 1 \$840; messenger; assistant messenger; messenger boy, \$480; assistant engineers—1 \$3,000, 1 \$2,400, 1 \$2,250; draftsmen—2 at \$1,800 each, 1 \$1,560, 1 \$1,500, 1 \$1,440, 2 at \$1,200 each; in all, \$65,830.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 126, line 5, before the words "of class one," to strike out "two hundred and forty-three" and insert "two hundred and eighty-three"; in line 8, before the words "at \$1,000," to strike out "one hundred and thirteen" and insert "eighty-three"; in the same line, before the words "at \$900," to strike out "ninety-one" and insert "eighty-one"; in line 11, before the words "three messengers," to strike out "two at \$720 each" and insert "one \$720"; in line 12, before the word "unskilled," to strike out "three" and insert "four"; and in line 14, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$664,460" and insert "\$673,460," so as to make the clause read:

Census Office: Director, \$6,000; four chief statisticians, at \$3,000 each; chief clerk, \$2,500; geographer, \$2,000; stenographer, \$1,500; nine expert chiefs of divisions, at \$2,000 each; clerks—15 of class 4, 25 of class 3, 40 of class 2, 283 of class 1 (4 transferred to Secretary's office), 83 at \$1,000 each, 81 at \$900 each (1 transferred to Secretary's office); skilled laborers—two at \$900 each (one transferred to Secretary's office), one \$720; three messengers; five assistant messengers; four unskilled laborers, at \$720 each; three messenger boys, at \$480 each (one transferred to Secretary's office); in all, \$673,460.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 127, line 6, after the word "Statistics," to insert "Provided further, That hereafter the Director of the Census may procure the information for the tobacco reports required by this act and the act approved April 30, 1912, by mail or by special agents or by other employees of the Bureau of the Census," so as to make the clause read:

For securing information for census reports, provided for by law, semi-monthly reports of cotton production, periodical reports of stocks of baled cotton in the United States and of the domestic and foreign consumption of cotton; quarterly reports of tobacco; per diem compensation of special agents and expenses of same and of detailed employees, whether employed in Washington, D. C., or elsewhere; the cost of transcribing State, municipal, and other records, temporary rental of quarters outside of the District of Columbia, for supervising special

agents, and employment by them of such temporary service as may be necessary in collecting the statistics required by law, including \$15,000 for collecting tobacco statistics authorized by law in addition to any other fund available therefor: *Provided*, That hereafter there shall be in the official organization of the bureau a separate, distinct, and independent division called the division of cotton and tobacco statistics: *Provided further*, That hereafter the Director of the Census may procure the information for the tobacco reports required by this act and the act approved April 30, 1912, by mail or by special agents or by other employees of the Bureau of the Census: *Provided further*, That the compensation of not to exceed five special agents provided for in this paragraph may be fixed at a rate not to exceed \$8 per day, \$512,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 128, line 8, after the words "United States," to insert "including exchange on official checks," and in line 9, after the word "checks," to strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$150,000," so as to make the clause read:

To further promote and develop the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, including exchange on official checks, \$150,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce: *Provided*, That not exceeding \$3,000 of this sum may be expended for the purchase of documents, manuscripts, plans, specifications, and other publications necessary for the promotion of our commercial interests: *Provided further*, That out of this sum there may be expended \$2,000 for the employment of an editorial assistant, and \$1,600 for an editorial clerk, in Washington, D. C., to edit the reports of the field agents employed under this appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 130, line 11, after the words "United States," to insert "exchange on official checks," so as to make the clause read:

Commercial attachés: For commercial attachés, to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, after examination to be held under his direction to determine their competency, and to be accredited through the State Department, whose duties shall be to investigate and report upon such conditions in the manufacturing industries and trade of foreign countries as may be of interest to the United States; and for one clerk to each of said commercial attachés to be paid a salary not to exceed \$1,500 each; and for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses, rent, purchase of reports, books of reference and periodicals, travel to and from the United States, exchange on official checks, and all other necessary expenses not included in the foregoing; such commercial attachés shall serve directly under the Secretary of Commerce and shall report directly to him, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 132, line 3, after the date "1911," to strike out "\$84,000" and insert "\$93,000," so as to make the clause read:

Clerk hire, service at large: For compensation, not exceeding \$1,500 a year to each person, of clerks to boards of steamboat inspectors, to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce in accordance with the provisions of section 4414, Revised Statutes, and the acts of April 9, 1906, and March 4, 1911, \$93,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 132, line 18, after the word "Commissioner," to strike out "\$4,000" and insert "\$4,500"; in line 21, before the words "at \$1,000," to strike out "two" and insert "four"; and in line 24, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$35,780" and insert "\$38,280," so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Navigation: Commissioner, \$4,500; deputy commissioner, \$2,400; chief clerk, \$2,000; clerk to commissioner, \$1,600; clerks—2 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 3 of class 2, 4 of class 1, 4 at \$1,000 each, 6 at \$900 each; 2 stenographers and typewriters to be employed not to exceed six months at the rate of \$75 per month each; 2 messengers; in all, \$38,280.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 124, line 3, after the word "boats," to strike out "\$22,000" and insert "\$33,500," so as to make the clause read:

Enforcement of navigation laws: To enable the Secretary of Commerce to provide and operate such motor boats and employ thereon such persons as may be necessary for the enforcement, under his direction by customs officers, of laws relating to navigation and inspection of vessels, boarding of vessels, and counting of passengers on excursion boats, \$33,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, line 11, after the word "therewith," to strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$18,000," so as to make the clause read:

To enable the Secretary of Commerce to employ temporarily, in addition to those now provided for by law, such other persons as may be necessary, of whom not more than two at any one time may be employed in the District of Columbia, to enforce the laws to prevent overcrowding of passenger and excursion vessels, and all necessary expenses in connection therewith, \$18,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, line 22, after the word "foregoing," to strike out "\$45,000" and insert "\$49,200," so as to make the clause read:

Wireless-communication laws: To enable the Secretary of Commerce to enforce the acts of Congress "to require apparatus and operators for radio communication on certain ocean steamers" and "to regulate radio communication" and carry out the international radio telegraphic convention, and to employ such persons and means as may be necessary, this employment to include salaries of employees in Washington not

exceeding \$7,150, traveling and subsistence expenses, purchase and exchange of instruments, technical books, rent, and all other miscellaneous items and necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, \$49,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for the maintenance of the Bureau of Standards, on page 135, line 12, before the words "of class 4," to strike out "one" and insert "two," and in the same line, before the words "of class 3," to strike out "one" and insert "two," so as to read:

Clerks—2 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 2 of class 2, 6 of class 1, 5 at \$1,000 each, 5 at \$900 each, 2 at \$720 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for the maintenance of the Bureau of Standards, on page 136, line 4, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$310,120" and insert "\$313,520," so as to read:

Ten laborers; janitors—three at \$660 each, one \$600; two female laborers, at \$360 each; in all, \$313,520.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 138, line 1, after the word "field," to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$125,000," so as to make the clause read:

For continuation of the investigation of structural materials, such as stone, clays, cement, and so forth, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$125,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 138, line 12, after the word "field," to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$40,000," so as to make the clause read:

For investigation of fire-resisting properties of building materials and conditions under which they may be most efficiently used, and for the standardization of types of appliances for fire prevention, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 138, line 18, after the word "field," to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$40,000," so as to make the clause read:

For investigation of the standards and methods of measurements of public utilities, such as gas, electric light, electric power, water, telephone, and electric railway service, and the solution of the problems which arise in connection with standards in such service, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 139, line 12, before the word "paint," to strike out "including cottonseed oil," and in line 14, after the word "field," to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000," so as to make the clause read:

To develop color standards and methods of manufacture and of color measurement, with special reference to their industrial use in standardization and specification of colorants such as dyestuffs, inks, and pigments, and other products, paint, paper, and textiles, in which color is a pertinent property, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 139, after line 14, to insert:

To study methods of measurement and technical processes used in the manufacture of pottery, brick, tile, terra cotta, and other clay products, and the study of the properties of the materials used in that industry, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$5,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask the chairman of the committee if he will not accept an amendment making the sum \$10,000, and let it go into conference?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have no objection.

Mr. SMOOT. I have some letters here that I wish to present to the conferees.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Let it go to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Change the amount from \$5,000 to \$10,000 in line 19.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, on page 140, line 18, after the word "field," to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$15,000," so as to make the clause read:

To develop methods of testing and standardizing machines, motors, tools, measuring instruments, and other apparatus and devices used in mechanical, hydraulic, and aeronautic engineering; for the comparative study of types of apparatus and methods of operation, and for the establishment of standards of performance; for the accurate determination of fundamental physical constants involved in the proper execution of this work; and for the scientific experiments and investigations needed in solving the problems which may arise in connection therewith, especially in response to the requirements of aeronautics and aviation for information of a purely scientific nature, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the head of "Department of Labor," on page 147, line 20, after the words "in all," to strike

out "\$36,100" and insert "\$38,100, of which sum not exceeding \$2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, which is made immediately available, shall be used for the repairs to the Mills Building which the Government is required to make under the terms of the lease," so as to make the clause read:

Contingent expenses, Department of Labor: For contingent and miscellaneous expenses of the offices and bureaus of the department, for which appropriations for contingent and miscellaneous expenses are not specifically made, including the purchase of stationery, furniture, and repairs to the same, carpets, matting, oilcloth, file cases, towels, ice, brooms, soap, sponges, laundry, street car tickets, not exceeding \$125, lighting and heating; maintenance and repair of a motor truck; purchase, exchange, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying vehicle for use of the Secretary and such other officials as exigency may require for official purposes; freight and express charges, postage to foreign countries, telegraph and telephone service, typewriters, adding machines and other labor-saving devices, including their exchange; repairs to the building occupied by the office of the Secretary of Labor; purchase of law books, books of reference, and periodicals not exceeding \$300; in all, \$38,100, of which sum not exceeding \$2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, which is made immediately available, shall be used for the repairs to the Mills Building which the Government is required to make under the terms of the lease; and in addition thereto such sum as may be necessary, not in excess of \$13,500, to facilitate the purchase, through the central purchasing office, as provided in the act of June 17, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 531), of certain supplies for the Immigration Service, shall be deducted from the appropriation "Expenses of regulating immigration" made for the fiscal year 1917 and added to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of Labor," for that year; and the total sum thereof shall be and constitute the appropriation for contingent expenses for the Department of Labor, to be expended through the central purchasing office (Division of Publications and Supplies), Department of Labor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 148, after line 17, to insert:

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into a contract for the lease of a modern fireproof building for the use of the Department of Labor for a period not to exceed five years, renewable, at the option of the Government, for an additional period not exceeding five years, at an annual rental not exceeding \$24,000 and at a rate per annum per square foot of available floor space not to exceed 36.3 cents.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Judicial," on page 149, line 3, after "\$4,500," to insert "9 law clerks, 1 for the Chief Justice and 1 for each Associate Justice, at not exceeding \$3,600 each per annum," and in line 7, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$153,500" and insert "\$185,900," so as to make the clause read:

Supreme Court: Chief Justice, \$15,000; 8 Associate Justices, at \$14,500 each; marshal, \$4,500; 9 law clerks, 1 for the Chief Justice and 1 for each Associate Justice, at not exceeding \$3,600 each per annum; 9 stenographic clerks, 1 for the Chief Justice and 1 for each Associate Justice, at not exceeding \$2,000 each; in all, \$185,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, on page 153, line 13, after the word "That," to strike out "appropriations in this act shall not" and insert "no part of any money appropriated by this or any other act shall," and in line 26, after the word "schools," to insert "Provided, That in construing this section the Commissioner of Patents shall advise the Comptroller of the Treasury as to whether the changes in any typewriter are of such structural character as to constitute a new machine not within the limitations of this section," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. That no part of any money appropriated by this or any other act shall be used during the fiscal year 1917 for the purchase of any typewriting machine at a price in excess of the lowest price paid by the Government of the United States for the same make and substantially the same model of machine during the fiscal year 1915; such price shall include the value of any typewriting machine or machines given in exchange, but shall not apply to special prices granted on typewriting machines used in schools of the District of Columbia or of the Indian Service, the lowest of which special prices paid for typewriting machines shall not be exceeded in future purchases for such schools: *Provided*, That in construing this section the Commissioner of Patents shall advise the Comptroller of the Treasury as to whether the changes in any typewriter are of such structural character as to constitute a new machine not within the limitations of this section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, page 154, line 11, after the word "made," to insert "Provided, That nothing in this section shall be deemed to apply to the investigation of any matter or the preparation, prosecution, or defense of any suit by the Department of Justice," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 5. That in expending appropriations made in this act persons in the classified service at Washington, D. C., shall not be detailed for service outside of the District of Columbia except for or in connection with work pertaining directly to the service at the seat of government of the department or other Government establishment from which the detail is made: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be deemed to apply to the investigation of any matter or the preparation, prosecution, or defense of any suit by the Department of Justice.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 154, after line 14, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 6. That no money appropriated by this or any other act shall be available for payment to any person receiving more than one salary when the combined amount of said salaries exceeds the sum of \$2,000

per annum, but this shall not apply to retired officers of the Army or Navy whenever they may be elected to public office or whenever the President shall appoint them to office by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE, Mr. SWANSON, and Mr. KERN addressed the Chair.

Mr. LODGE. I merely wish to offer an amendment to the amendment. I dare say the Senator from Virginia rose to offer the same amendment I was going to propose.

Mr. SWANSON. About the Marine Corps?

Mr. LODGE. To insert, after the word "Navy," the words "Marine Corps."

Mr. SWANSON. And, in line 20, "appointed or."

Mr. LODGE. "Appointed or" before "elected."

Mr. OVERMAN. What is the amendment?

Mr. LODGE. The amendment is to insert, after "retired officers of the Army or Navy," the words "or Marine Corps," and, of course, it ought also to read "whenever they may be appointed or elected to public office."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 154, in section 6, after the word "Army," insert a comma and strike out the word "or"; after the word "Navy" insert the words "or Marine Corps"; and, in line 20, before the word "elected," insert "appointed or"; so as to make the section read:

SEC. 6. That no money appropriated by this or any other act shall be available for payment to any person receiving more than one salary when the combined amount of said salaries exceeds the sum of \$2,000 per annum, but this shall not apply to retired officers of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps whenever they may be appointed or elected to public office or whenever the President shall appoint them to office by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think that is a proper amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the Senator from Virginia if he has any further amendment from the committee?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There is no further amendment to submit on the part of the committee.

Mr. KERN. On line 5, page 124, I move to strike out the words "1 law clerk, \$2,000," and to insert the words "2 law clerks, at \$2,000 each."

Mr. SMOOT. Where is the amendment proposed to be inserted?

The SECRETARY. At page 124, line 5.

Mr. KERN. That is the exact number of law clerks the Solicitor of the Treasury now has, and the House struck out the provision for one of them. The Solicitor of the Treasury has a chief clerk and two law clerks, and they are absolutely necessary. I myself have personal knowledge to that effect.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think the amendment ought to be adopted. When we get into conference, if we find any reason to doubt the wisdom of that action, it will be attended to, but I think the amendment is all right.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, which I send to the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, line 12, it is proposed to strike out the word "thirty-two," and to insert "thirty-four," so as to read:

Thirty-four at \$1,440 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 71, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "seventeen hundred dollars," and to insert in lieu thereof "eighteen hundred dollars."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know whether or not the chairman of the committee desires to say anything on that amendment, but it proposes an increase of the two translators' salaries from \$1,700 to \$1,800 each. That question was discussed before the committee; it was considered not only by the subcommittee but by the whole committee, and was rejected. Does the Senator desire to accept that amendment?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do not think the amendment ought to be accepted. The committee gave as careful consideration to it as it could. I shall not, however, object at this late

hour in the afternoon to the amendment, as I am anxious to finish the bill. We can investigate it in conference. I do not think, however, it is right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I wish to say, in connection with the Senator's statement, that that increase has been estimated for.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am fully aware of that fact. It was estimated for at \$1,800. That is correct.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. And it is recommended by the chief of the bureau.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish, for information, to make an inquiry regarding section 6. As I understand it, the combined amount of salaries that one person may draw has heretofore been limited to \$2,500. Am I correct in that?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. No. The former law was that no clerk who was receiving as much as \$2,500 per annum should have any second appointment at all.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why was that amount reduced to \$2,000? Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Because we were informed of abuses in some of the departments; that when they could not raise a clerk's salary—when Congress refused to make the allowance—they would just give him some other place in addition to that which he held.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is entirely satisfactory to me, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Are any of these items of the bill now subject to points of order as in Committee of the Whole?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A point of order might have been made when they were presented.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I did not hear the inquiry of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I was asking if any of the items of the bill are now subject to a point of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Which items?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Any items of the bill as considered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am not aware of any being subject to a point of order. If they are subject to a point of order, I hope the Senator from Texas is not going to make any such point. It is too late to do so, in fact.

Mr. ROBINSON. The amendments made as in Committee of the Whole have all been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have been agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON. Then they are not now subject to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have been agreed to as in Committee of the Whole; but, if it is a committee amendment, the point of order might be made when the bill comes into the Senate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it too late to make the point of order to any paragraph of the bill as adopted by the Senate as in Committee of the Whole?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To amendments of the committee?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can not make a point of order against any provision in the House bill in roman type.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is the information I desired, Mr. President. I wish to ask a further question: May a point of order be submitted when the bill reaches the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be.

Mr. SHEPPARD. To any item of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I merely desire to reserve the right to make a point of order against any item in the bill when it reaches the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Senator's right.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from California will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 63, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,800," and to insert in lieu thereof "\$3,000," so that it amended it will read:

San Francisco, Office of Assistant Treasurer: * * * Cashier, who also acts as vault clerk, \$3,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I make the point of order that this is an increase of appropriation without an estimate from the department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the procedure of the Senate in reference to such matters, but I know that the other House arbitrarily reduced this cashier's salary from \$3,000 to \$2,800. It seems to me at a time when the work has grown to enormous proportions, when hundreds of millions of dollars are in the vaults, and this cashier is also the custodian of the vaults, it is manifestly unfair to reduce his salary. A recognition of this kind is a direct incentive to bad service among the public employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the proposed increase has not been estimated for, the Chair will sustain the point of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It has not been estimated for.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 9, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "one, \$840"; and, in line 14, to strike one "seven" and to insert "six."

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. As I understand, the Senator from Massachusetts offers those amendments to follow what was inserted a little while ago.

Mr. WEEKS. Exactly.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think the amendments are proper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the amendments proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts are agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, if it does not disturb the harmony of the proceedings, about clerks and messengers to committees. That proposition has been adopted, I know, but I have understood that where a chairman of a committee, an inactive committee, such, for instance, as the Committee on Revolutionary Claims or the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments—

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I object to any reference to the latter committee in that way. I have found, to my surprise, that that is a very active committee. It works nearly every day.

Mr. KENYON. Which one of the committees?

Mr. JONES. The Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

Mr. KENYON. Then I exclude that committee from my remarks and apologize to the Senator from Washington. I wish to ask where a Senator has been the chairman of such a committee and goes out of office on the 4th of March, are the clerks of that committee and the secretary and the messenger to that committee each paid until the time that the new Senator comes in, or does the service of those employees terminate when the service of the Senator terminates?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I believe such employees continue to draw their salaries until the new Senator comes in.

Mr. WARREN. That is usually provided for toward the close of a Congress by a provision that they shall remain.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That is correct; but it is not a hardship, when people are turned loose in that way for two or three months, and until they can establish themselves in some other business, for the Government to pay them during that time. I have never felt that it was an economy that commended itself to a great Government that where employees were unexpectedly deprived of their places they should not be permitted to draw their salaries for two or three months until they could get into some other business. I do not think it is a vital matter to the United States Government.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, it is not vital to the United States Government to try to save any money anywhere; I realize that; but I wondered how long those salaries run and how much they amount to in such cases.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It may be nothing; we can not tell; but it is a bagatelle.

Mr. KENYON. Would it amount to \$22,000 or \$23,000?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do not think it would amount to so much as that. I have not the slightest idea that it would. I think it does not amount to half of that sum.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I wish to take just a moment. I hold in my hand a praised, but a much fractured and forgotten document, that was used a few years ago very generally,

from which I desire to read a paragraph. The document to which I refer reads as follows:

We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toll. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which benefits a democratic government, and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

Mr. PHELAN. The cashier in the office of the assistant treasurer at San Francisco is a victim of that doctrine.

Mr. JONES. I find in the last Republican legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, the appropriations were \$35,172,434.50. This bill, brought in by our Democratic friends, carries \$38,196,762.25. The estimate for the legislative bill submitted by the Republican administration for the year ending June 30, 1914, was \$36,514,955.50; the estimate submitted for the year ending June 30, 1917, by the present administration, was \$39,749,377.25. I am glad, Mr. President, that this administration is not adhering to that paragraph of the Democratic platform, but is making the necessary appropriations for the proper conduct of the business of the Government.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, of course the Senator understands the reason for that, does he not, and realizes how that was brought about? The Republicans failed to appropriate sufficient money just before they went out of power, so that we have been compelled to provide more money to conduct properly the affairs of the Government.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I simply wanted to put the facts in the RECORD, and our Democratic friends can explain them as they see fit.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] has again directed the attention of the Senate to that plank in the Democratic platform to which I have sometimes adverted. I do not perceive on either side of the Chamber any great tendency toward it; and although the question of economy should not be a partisan one, thus far I have noticed during my short experience in the Senate no exhibition of a desire to economize on either side of the Chamber. With the exception of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], and the Senator from Washington, I have observed no symptoms of economy either with regard to general appropriations or to bills carrying specific appropriations. And on this side of the Chamber conditions are about the same. And I have a lively recollection that during the summer of 1913 the Senator from Washington obstructed the business of the Senate of the United States day after day—and I am told that it costs the country about a thousand dollars an hour to enjoy that luxury known as the Senate of the United States—in order to get an extra clerk at \$1,200 or \$1,300. He finally wore us out and carried his point. We found it was more economical to let him have the extra clerk, with the expense involved, than to put the country to the continued additional expense consequent upon his persistent efforts. I still hope—although the hope is not a very strong one—that the people, who are really and primarily responsible for the extravagances of Congress, will ultimately realize the necessity of beginning at home with economy and demand of their Senators and Representatives that they decrease appropriations, many of which are entirely unnecessary.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, of course, in what I read I did not intend to make any personal reference to the Senator from Colorado; but I trust that the Senator will see to it that in the next Democratic platform there are no such apparently meaningless charges as that contained in the platform from which I have quoted.

The Senator, I think, if his recollection will go back, will remember that several times I have joined with him in attempting to eliminate appropriations or, in other words, to economize. Possibly the Senator was not very earnest in what he was desiring, and, as he and I were about the only ones who were working together, I confess that I got a little bit discouraged, as he seems to be. Of course, I have not learned of any Senator on the other side of the Chamber who seems to be willing to give up any of his clerical help for the useless committees which I myself have been trying for some time to get rid of. I do not, however, seem to be able to get very much assistance from the other side of the Chamber, and I have not heard the clarion voice of my friend from Colorado coming to my relief in this respect at all.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole were concurred in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is now in the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish to inquire if a point of order against the item, on line 4, page 2, is in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make a point of order?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to make a point of order, if it is permissible, against that item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If it is in the text of the House bill, it is not in order.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is in the House text.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then I will state that I intended to make the point of order that that provision which reads "for mileage of Senators, \$51,000," is contrary to law and not authorized by law; but, of course, inasmuch as the Presiding Officer states that it is not subject to a point of order, having come over from the House, I shall not make the point of order.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on next Wednesday morning I will submit some remarks on the Army reorganization bill.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pittsfield, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Boston, Somerville, Brookline, Everett, Malden, Melrose, Cambridge, and Worcester, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota presented petitions of Rev. Naphtale Lucock, of Helena; of William Henry Talmage, of Flandreau; and of sundry citizens of Sioux Falls, all in the State of South Dakota, praying for the establishment of Government economic experiment stations, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. JONES presented memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Everett, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to fix standard prices for patented and trade-marked articles, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented petitions of Local Grange No. 200, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ellensburg; of Buena Vista Grange, No. 415, Patrons of Husbandry, of Prosser; and of sundry citizens of Colville, all in the State of Washington, praying for Government ownership of telephone and telegraph systems, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of Local Grange No. 209, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ellensburg; of Mount Corgan Grange, No. 409, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rice; and of sundry citizens of Colville, all in the State of Washington, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Spokane and Richland, in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PHELAN presented petitions of Bennington Camp, No. 20, United Spanish War Veterans, of San Diego, and of Local Branch, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of San Francisco, in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish-American War, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 26, Laundry Workers' Union, of San Francisco, and of the Federated Trades Council, of Sacramento, in the State of California, praying for an investigation into the conditions surrounding the marketing of dairy products, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Los Gatos, Cal., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DU PONT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wilmington and Newport, in the State of Delaware, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the

right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the City Council of Wilmington, Del., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to employees of the Postal Service, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Delaware, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Stuttgart, Ark., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of North Carolina, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented memorials of sundry citizens of Fort Worth and Waco, in the State of Texas, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Paint Rock, Water Valley, San Angelo, Sterling City, Crosby, Thrall Circuit, Dallas, Washita, and Oakwood, all in the State of Texas, and of sundry citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Montavilla, Oreg., remonstrating against appropriations being made for sectarian purposes, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Oregon, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Oregon, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maine, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2458) authorizing the Cowlitz Tribe of Indians residing in the State of Washington to submit claims to the Court of Claims, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 333) thereon.

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (S. 4974) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Corvallis, in the State of Oregon, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 332) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TAGGART:

A bill (S. 5416) to place on the retired list of the Army the names of the surviving officers who were mustered out under the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 15, 1870, in reduction of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5417) granting an increase of pension to Loami E. Scherer;

A bill (S. 5418) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Meredith;

A bill (S. 5419) granting a pension to Marilla Barnes (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5420) granting an increase of pension to John R. Kingman (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5421) granting an increase of pension to William D. Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANE:

A bill (S. 5422) granting a pension to George Hillis (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5423) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Monroe (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 5424) to construct a bridge in San Juan County, State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 5425) to standardize lime barrels; to the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 5426) granting a pension to Mary A. Barber; to the Committee on Pensions.

FOX RIVER BRIDGE, ILLINOIS.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, may I ask consent, without violating the rule, that I may tender a bill for private relief where a bridge has been condemned over a river caused by some flood or something in the community? The public-utilities commission has requested the Chicago & North Western to promptly put in a new bridge across a little river called the Fox River. I am told that there is not any navigation except for fishing, and it is necessary to get permission of the War Department. I ask the privilege that I may tender the bill preliminary to asking the Secretary of War to investigate the subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 5415) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Fox River at Geneva, Ill.; to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT TO POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HUGHES submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$62,000 to adjust the compensation of printers employed in certain post offices, intended to be proposed by him to the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 10484), which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

Mr. WALSH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 780) validating certain homestead entries, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Mr. JONES submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the amendment submitted by Mr. SMITH of South Carolina to the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. SIMMONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the amendment submitted by Mr. SMITH of South Carolina to the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. OWEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12766) to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES.

Mr. REED submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 159), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized, during the Sixty-fourth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

RESOURCES OF ARID-LAND STATES (S. DOC. NO. 391).

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I ask to have printed as a public document an article by Mr. I. S. Barlett, of Cheyenne, Wyo., on the marvelous resources of the arid-land States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I should like to know what the title of the article is or what it is about?

Mr. SHAFROTH. It embraces a lot of statistics concerning water power.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very well; I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter submitted by the Senator from Colorado will be printed as a public document.

RECESS.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday morning next at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m., Saturday, April 8, 1916) the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 10, 1916, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, April 8, 1916.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, our Father in heaven, that amid the roar and din of battle, the suffering, intense pain, and sorrows incident thereto, the angel of the Red Cross is pouring out Thy love in the oil of tenderness and mercy in its healing touch and comforting message.

We thank Thee for the great organization whose altruistic efforts lend a touch of human kindness to the awful picture. In it the Son of Man lives, and we pray that His blessed presence may dissipate the demons of hate and revenge, and through His spirit grant that the eyes of the blind may be opened, the ears of the deaf unstopped, and cold hearts be warmed again into love, peace, and good will for all mankind; that the prayer of prayers may be answered, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of woman suffrage by printing a letter and resolution from the Congressional Union of the State of Washington and my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of woman suffrage. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MINORITY VIEWS—ARMOR-PLATE BILL.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority may have three days in which to present the minority views on the armor-plate bill, S. 1417.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] asks unanimous consent that the minority of the Committee on Naval Affairs shall have three legislative days in which to file its views as to the armor-plate factory. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter which I addressed to Dr. Melvin, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the reply to the same by Secretary Houston, in regard to the dairy and creamery industries of the country.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter which he wrote to the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry and the answer to the same, written by Secretary Houston. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. TAGGART. I rise to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of a movement toward adopting a universal alphabet. By request I introduced resolution No. 99 for that purpose—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has a right to ask unanimous consent, but not to argue. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of a universal alphabet?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, what is it? It is evidently not a speech.

Mr. TAGGART. It is not a speech; and I wish to say to the House that I have not, by any means, prepared all of it, and there is not very much of it. But I have been repeatedly asked and questioned for the last several weeks, while I was very busy, to get these remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. If there is not much of it, I shall not object.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, these matters of extension go in the back of the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. Of course they do. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire who it is or what agency it is that is urging this?

Mr. TAGGART. There is no agency that I know of, no organization that I know of, with a president, secretary, or treasurer, but a number of scholars in this country and teachers, particularly represented by a gentleman by the name of Mr. Robert Stein, an employee of the Government here, interested in the question of a movement to have a universal alphabet, so that people will study each other's languages.